

of the infernal regions whose acquaintance I made in these parts, and who throws those whom he possesses into a state suggestive of one attacked simultaneously with hysterics, epilepsy, ague, and colic, a fearful combination, it is true, and to fully realise which, the reader must make a trip to Chang-Bhokár, which, geographically speaking, is one of the Chutiá-Nágpúr Tributary States, but which psychologically, I think, must be one of the outlying provinces of Pandemonium.

The bride's father having treated each of the demoniacs to three cupsful of liquor and a mouthful of ghí, Bágghesar's spirit vanished, leaving both the men considerably blown and exhausted.

During the whole of this scene not a soul spoke, and the general impression seemed to be, that it was too solemn a matter to be sneered or laughed at. Still no marriage ceremony is complete without it, and, according to Gond ideas, fortune smiles on the wedded couple when Bágghesar appears.

If the bride's parents are poor and have not the means to afford a kid, a pig is given instead. This I should think can't be quite so pleasant for the demoniacs, but the fun no doubt would be considerably enhanced to those lookers-on who, like myself, had nothing to fear from Bágghesar, and could therefore with impunity smile at his pranks.

Of the extraordinary nature of the scene in general, no description could ever supply a perfectly accurate conception; but, as an illustration of the superstitious belief and worship of one of the most interesting of the aboriginal tribes of India, it is nevertheless worthy of record.



Essays in aid of a Comparative Grammar of the Gaurian Languages.—By
REV. A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE, D. Ph., Professor of Sanskrit, Jay
Náráyan's College, Benares.

I.—*Introductory.*

It may be convenient to have a collective name for all North-Indian languages derived from the Sanskrit. As Dráviḍian is now, after the example set by Dr. Caldwell in his Comparative Grammar of the Dráviḍian languages, the name generally received to designate the non-Sanskritic languages of South India, and as Gaurian (गौड़) is the term commonly used by Sanskrit writers as the correlative to Dráviḍian (द्राविड़), it appears to be the simplest plan to appropriate the term Gaurian for the Sanskritic languages of North India.*

The following languages must be accounted Gaurian: *viz.*, the Oriyá, the Bangáli, the Hindí, the Naipáli, the Maráthí, the Gujarátí, the Sindhí,

* If I am not much mistaken, I have already seen the word Gaurian employed by some writers in this wise, so that its use by me is not a novelty.

Note to p. 119.

Bághesar means 'the Tiger-God,' from *bág'h*, a tiger, and *eshwar*, 'God.' Compare also Herklots's 'Manners and Customs of the Mussulmans of India,' p. 220,—“After the demoniae is well filled with the devil, he sometimes sereeching takes a *kakra* (large wick), continues lighting and extinguishing it by putting the lighted end into his mouth; *some, biting the neck of a fowl, suck its blood.*”



the Panjábí (or Gurmukhí), and the Kashmirí. They are divided into two groups by some striking grammatical peculiarities, of which I may here mention two, which will more immediately concern us in the following essays. One is the possession of an eighth case of agent (over and above the common seven Sanskrit cases), formed by the post-position न (or नै; in the Naipáli, ल); a correlate of which is the absence of an organic past tense of the verb. The other is the adjective character of the genitive post-positions, which agree with the noun which they qualify, in gender, number, and case. These peculiarities are possessed by all Gaurian languages except the Oriyá and Bangálí, which two latter, therefore, form a group by themselves; the remainder making up the other group.

The Hindí is the most extensively spoken of all the Gaurian languages. Its area consists of nearly 40,000 square miles, and extends from the River Ganđak in the east to the Satlaj in the west, and from the Himálaya in the north to the Vindhya Mountains in the south. But a distinction must be made between the high Hindí and the low Hindí, the mutual relation of which shows many striking resemblances to that between the high and low German. I take here the terms high and low in their ordinary sense, meaning by high the cultivated, the language of literature, and by low, the vulgar spoken dialects. The high Hindí is used almost exclusively for literature over the whole area, and is understood everywhere; though it is perhaps nowhere spoken in its purity by the people: at all events, it is spoken only by the higher and educated classes. The high Hindí does not differ from the Urdú in its grammar; and in its vocabulary only so far, that it substitutes for all foreign (*i. e.*, Persian or Arabic) words, others transferred to it *directly* from the Sanskrit. It arose gradually by the substitution of Sanskrit words partly for foreign words, partly for such Prákrít words as had become, in the course of time, obsolete or vulgar; and the cause of this substitution was partly the revival of Hindú patriotism, partly the impetus given to Hindí literature through the introduction by the English of vernacular education and Christian missions. It is, therefore, a comparatively modern language. In fact, its formation and growth is still going on, as any one who takes an interest in such matters may verify by personal observation.

While the high Hindí is uniform and spread over the whole area of the Hindí, the low Hindí consists of many dialects differing more or less among themselves and confined to different provinces. But they may be divided into two great classes, of which the Braj Bháshá and the (so-called) Gañwári, respectively, are typical. The former class occupies the western, the latter the eastern half of the Hindí area. Roughly speaking, the boundary line may be drawn at 80° Long. To the western class belong, besides the typical Braj Bháshá spoken in the Ágrá and Mathurá Districts, the Dialects of

Gwáliár, Alwar, Jaipúr, the Márwáří dialect, &c. To the eastern class belong, beside the typical Gaṇwáří spoken in the Benares Division, the Baiswáří* dialect of Audh, the Maithilí dialect of Tirhut, and others. The differences between these two classes are so great as to constitute them almost two different languages; for the Gaṇwáří and its class of dialects participate in most of the characteristics of the Bangálí class of the Gaurian languages, while the Braj Bháshá class of dialects share those of the other Gaurian languages. The Gaṇwáří, as its name which means 'rustic' or 'vulgar' (ग्रामवारी, confined to villages) indicates, has never received any literary cultivation, and is confined to the low and uneducated part of the population. Throughout the whole area of the latter, a more or less pure high Hindí is spoken and written by the higher and the educated classes. Hence here the area of the Hindí class of the Gaurian languages and that of the Bangálí class overlap each other, the Gaṇwáří forming a sort of transition language between the two. The Braj Bháshá on the other hand has begun from early times to receive some literary cultivation. Most Hindí poets within the last 400 years (*e. g.*, Kabír, Biháří Lál, Súr Dás, Tulsí Dás, &c.) have employed it principally in their poems. Hence it has become the mother of the Urdú and high Hindí. The latter derive by far the greatest part of their grammar and vocabulary from it. In fact, it is distinguished from the high Hindí chiefly by a greater roughness and a greater abundance of its grammatical forms. Grammars of the Braj Bháshá have been written in modern times, *e. g.*, by Ballantyne, and in the Hindí and Hindústání Selections; and perhaps the best known prose work written in it is the *Ríjanítí*, a translation of the Sanskrit *Hitopadeshá*.

Two opposite opinions are held by different scholars regarding the nature of the Gaurian languages. While some Orientalists consider them to be, with trifling exceptions in the vocabulary, wholly Sanskritic, others admit large un-Sanskritic additions, both in the grammar and in the vocabulary. According to Dr. Caldwell,† *e. g.*, "the grammatical structure of the spoken idioms of Northern India was from the first, and always continued to be, in the main Scythian; and the change which took place when Sanskrit acquired the predominance as the Aryans gradually extended their conquests and their colonies, was rather a change of vocabulary than of grammar; a

* The derivation of Baiswára is uncertain. According to some Pandits, it is connected with the word वैश्वानर, which is said to be the name of a Kshatriya tribe living in Audh, who gave to their country the name of the Baiswára country, and to their dialect the name of the Baiswáří dialect. According to others, it is a modification of वैश्ववारी. The meaning of the name would then be: the dialect confined to the Vaisyas, or rustics; and it would be almost identical with the meaning of the name Gaṇwáří, which is a modification of ग्रामवारी, *i. e.*, confined to villages.

† Comparative Grammar, p. 38.

change not so much in arrangement and vital spirit as in the *matériel* of the language. Seeing that the northern vernaculars possess with the words of the Sanskrit a grammatical structure which in the main appears to be Scythian, it seems more correct to represent these languages as having a Scythian basis with a large and overwhelming Sanskrit addition, than as having a Sanskrit basis with a small admixture of a Scythian element." If this theory should be true, the Gaurian languages could no more be accounted Sanskritic or Indo-European, any more than the Drávidian languages. For languages must be classified according to their grammatical structure.* Otherwise, English (Johnsonian English at all events) would have to be counted among the Romance, and Urdú among the Semitic languages. But the whole question is hardly yet ripe for adjudication. The Gaurian languages have as yet had very little attention paid to them as regards their nature and origin. Moreover in such an investigation a serious difficulty is met with at the outset in the extreme want and inaccessibility of the Gaurian literature dating from the time when the Gaurian languages took their origin (about 800 to 1200, A. D.). As up to this time the Aryan population of North India, who had immigrated many centuries before, had used exclusively Sanskritic languages (Sanskrit, Páli, Prákrit), it would be a most remarkable phenomenon, if they, a Culturvolk, had now exchanged their native grammar for that of the uncultured and despised aboriginal population; supposing that the language of the latter was really a non-Aryan one, and that it had really survived the long Aryan occupation; both suppositions by no means established as yet. It has happened more than once that a conquering nation (especially, if inferior in culture), while retaining more or less its native vocabulary, adopted the grammar of the conquered people (as the Normans in England, the Arabs and Turks in North India, the Franks in Gaul), under the condition that this process commenced from the very first beginning of the conquest. But that the conquerors, after having resided for centuries in the country and retained their native language (both in grammar and vocabulary, trifling instances in the latter excepted) entirely unmixed with the aboriginal languages, should abandon their own grammar in favour of that of the conquered, requires strong proofs to be credited, especially as it is by no means certain whether the aboriginal languages at all survived at so late a date; for, according to the evidence afforded by the Prákrit of the plays, Prákrit was spoken by the low class population, which was composed, no doubt, principally of the subjugated aboriginal people, who, therefore, either spoke a Sanskritic language from the first or adopted the vulgar dialect of the language of their conquerors.

* Compare Max Müller's remarks in *Lectures on the Science of Language*, lect. II., pp. 86-90 (6th Ed.).

If by a more thorough investigation of the Gauṛian languages it can be shown, that they are entirely Sanskritic, this will, on account of the many undoubted resemblances between the Gauṛian and Dráviḍian languages (cf. Dr. Caldwell's *Comparative Grammar*, pp. 34 to 39), materially affect our view of the classification of the latter. However, this problem awaits yet a thorough scientific enquiry. And the following essays are offered as a slight contribution towards its solution. For the inflexional post-positions of the Gauṛian languages are, above other points, considered to be evidences of the Dráviḍian* or Seythian† character of their grammatical structure.

Essay II.—On the Post-Positions of the Genitive.

The present essay will be devoted to the elucidation of the nature and origin of the post-positions of the genitive. They are the following :—

In the High Hindí,	-	-	-	का, कौ, के;
Braj Bháslá,	-	-	-	कौ, कौ, के;
Alwar Dialect,	-	-	-	को, कौ, के, का;
Gaṇwári,	-	-	-	कै, के;
Maithilí,	-	-	-	क;
Naipáli,	-	-	-	को, कौ, का;
Maráthí,	-	-	-	चा, ची, चें, चे, चा, चीं;
Gujarátí,	-	-	-	नो, नौ, नूं, ना, नां;
Panjábí,	-	-	-	दा, दी, दूं;
Sindhí,	-	-	-	जो, जी, जे, जा;
Bangálí,	-	-	-	एर or र;
Oṛiyá,	-	-	-	र;

The only attempt at an explanation of the origin of these post-positions that I remember to have met with, is one made by Bopp in his *Comparative Grammar*, para. 340, note.‡

He compares the Hindí genitives formed by means of the post-positions का, etc., with the Sanskrit genitive plural अस्माकम् of अहम् I, and दुष्माकम् of त्वम् thou, etc. These words are possessive pronomina (*our* and *your*) formed by the affix क. Others also have referred to this Sanskrit affix क or कौय, which expresses relation or possession, as an explanation of the Hindí post-positions. But there are serious objections to this theory.

* By Dr. Stevenson, in the *Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society*.

† Cf. Dr. Caldwell's *Comparative Grammar*, p. 39. He seems, however, inclined to admit a Sanskritic origin of the genitive post-positions, cf. p. 246.

‡ He says: Es verdient bemerkt zu werden, dass im Hindostanischen die Formen, die man in beiden zahlen aller declinations-faehigen woerter als genitive aufstellt, sich als unverkennbare possessiva herausstellen, dadurch dass sie sich nach dem Geschlechte des folgenden Substantives richten. Die pronomina erster und zweiter person habon im masc. rá, im fem. rí, als possessiv suffix, die uebrigen woerter im masc. ká, im Fem. kí; ká aber stimmt zum skr. suffix ka von asmáka, yusmáka, mámaka, távaka.

The form of the word to which the post-positions are added, is not *always* the pure base, as the addition of the Sanskrit affix would require, but already *inflected* (e. g., घोड़े in घोड़े का, of a horse, is not the simple base of the word घोड़ा, but an inflected form of it). Again, it is most unlikely that elements like the affixes क, कोय, etc., which occur in Sanskrit only as integral parts of a word, but never by themselves as independent words, should have, in a comparatively modern language, separated themselves from the body of the word and assumed independent life (as post-positions) similar to that of prepositions. It would be a phenomenon contrary to those that have been observed in all other cases of (what Max Müller calls) dialectic regeneration. It is clear also that by this theory the other post-positions (as स, में, ने) cannot be explained. But there can be no doubt that, whatever the true explanation be, it must be the same for all post-positions. For these reasons among others, any theory which traces the post-positions to Sanskrit affixes cannot be the true one. Their explanation must be sought for in a different direction.

In the first place, it may be remarked that the term "post-position" is misleading. It gives the idea as if the words, to which it is applied, belonged to that class of words which includes the prepositions, conjunctions, etc., *i. e.*, elements of language which are incapable of either derivation or inflexion. Now most of the so-called post-positions of the genitive are capable of both. They have clearly a nominal or more accurately an *adjective* character. For the Hindi का, को, के, agree with the noun which they qualify, in case, number, and gender, exactly as for instance, अच्छा, अच्छी, अच्छे, good. If the qualified noun is a masculine singular nominative, then का is used; if a feminine singular or plural, then को; if a masculine plural nominative, then के; if a masculine in any *oblique* case, then के. The same is the case with the Panjabi दा, दी, दे, the Braj Bhashá कौ, को, के, etc. In the Sindhi, जो and जो are used like का and को in High Hindi; जा is used, if the qualified noun is in the masculine plural nominative, and जे is used, if it is a masculine in any *oblique* case singular or plural. With this agrees the use of the post-positions कौ, को, का, के, of the Alwar and Jaipur dialect.

After these explanations the following scheme of the agreement* of the

* This agreement is not altogether perfect; but neither is the agreement of the *real* adjective with its substantive more so; e. g., in Hindi, कौ and के ought to have a different form in the plural; probably these plural forms are irregularly adopted from the singular; but then अच्छा, good, has also both in the singular and plural अच्छी, अच्छे. Originally, the agreement was much more perfect. This is clearly proved by the Maráthí, where "sometimes, in poetry, the adjective takes a case-form corresponding to that of the noun it qualifies; thus:

दास्यकरावें भावें न असावें मानसें उदासीनें "

Student's Manual of Maráthí Grammar, p. 39.

Gaurian genitive post-positions with the noun qualified by them will be easily understood—

	SINGULAR.						PLURAL.					
	Direct case.			Oblique cases.			Direct case.			Oblique cases.		
	mas.	fem.	neutr.	mas.	fem.	neutr.	mas.	fem.	neutr.	mas.	fem.	neutr.
High Hindí,	का	की	—	के	की	—	के	की	—	के	की	—
Braj Bháshá,	कौ	की	—	के	की	—	के	की	—	के	की	—
Alwar dialect, ...	को	की	—	के	की	—	का	की	—	के	की	—
Ganwárá,	कै	कै	—	के	के	—	कै	कै	—	के	के	—
Maithilí,	क	क	—	क	क	—	क	क	—	क	क	—
Naipálí,	को	की	—	का	की	—	का	की	—	का	की	—
Maráthí,	चा	ची	चै	च्या	च्या	च्या	चे	च्या	चीं	च्या	च्या	च्या
				or	or	or				or	or	or
				चे	चे	चे				चे	चे	चे
Gujarátí,*	ने	नी	नु	ना	नी	गां	ना	नी	गां	ना	नी	नां
Panjábí,	दा	दी	—	दे	दी	—	दे	दी	—	दे	दी	—
Sindhí,	जा	जी	—	जे	जी	—	जा	जी	—	जे	जी	—
Bangálí,	एर	एर	एर	एर	एर	एर	एर	एर	एर	एर	एर	एर
	or	or	or	or	or	or	or	or	or	or	or	or
	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र
Oriya,	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र	र

The *adjective* character of these so-called post-positions indicates that we must look for a *nominal* source of them in Sanskrit.

It is a well-known observation that in poetry and in the vulgar dialects, old grammatical forms are often preserved which have been altogether lost in the cultivated dialects. These archaic forms do the same service to the student of language as fossil remains do to the student of geology. They discover to us language in its earliest state from which it has developed into its present form.†

In the Ganwárá dialect, sometimes, there is found in the genitive the post-position कर, or करे, instead of कै. It is there confined to the pronominal declension; *e. g.*, इस का, of him, is in Ganwárá एकर, or एकै; इस के is एकरे, or एकै; इन का, of them, is एन्हकर, or एन्ह कै; इन के is एन्हकरे, or एन्ह के; again,

* The forms as in use among the Maráthís and Gujarátís settled in Bonares and Gayá (and probably anywhere in the Hindí country) differ slightly from those given above. In Maráthí the form of the direct case plural of the neuter is चै, instead of चीं, and in the Gujarátí, the form of the oblique cases singular in all three genders is alike ने, instead of ना, ने, नां. These differences are evidently merely assimilations to the Hindí.

† "In every country it is in the poetry and in the speech of the peasantry that the ancient condition of language is best studied." Dr. Caldwell, *Comp. Gram.*, p. 31.

किस का घर, whose house, is in Gaṅwári केकर घर, or केके घर; किस क घर में in whose house, is केकरे घरे, &c. The same post-position करे is frequently met with in the Ramáyana of Tulsí Dás (about 1650, A. D.). But there it is not confined to pronouns, but also used in connexion with nouns, *e. g.*,

चत्रि जाति कर रोप ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí: चत्रियों की जाति का क्रोध ॥

Lanká kaṇḍ

Besides कर, Tulsí Dás uses sometimes another form which is still more archaic, viz. केर, or केरा, केरी, केरे. They are used exactly as का, को, के; as केर (केरा) corresponds to the Gaṅwári क, so केरे to the Gaṅwári करे; *e. g.*, केरा occurs in the following verse:

शिर चानड सब शत्रुन्ह केरा *i. e.*

High Hindí: शिर ले आँधो सब शत्रुओं का.

Lanká kaṇḍ.

(Here possibly केरा might be used as a Nom. Pl., like का in the Alwar and Jaipur dialect, and जा in Sindhi).

Again, एक नारि ब्रत रघुपति केरा ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí, एक स्त्री रखना ब्रत है राम का ॥

Again, केरो occurs in the following verses:

सगुन प्रतीति भेंट प्रिय केरो ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí: सगुन की प्रतीति से प्रिय की भेंट (जानती है सीता) ॥

Ayudhyá kaṇḍ.

Or: सुनि कठोर वाणी कपि केरी ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí: सुन के कठोर वाणी बन्दर की ॥

Lanká kaṇḍ.

Or: अब सो सुनइ बाँह तेहि केरी ।

गइ जिमि लङ्क लक्षण भर प्रेरो ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí: अब वह सुनो कि बाँह उस की ।

गयी जिस प्रकार से लङ्का को लक्षण के बाण से फेंकी हुई ॥

Lanká kaṇḍ.

Again केरे occurs in the following verses:

बन्दै पदसरोज सब केरे ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí: मैं नमन करता हूँ सरोज सदृश पद सभों के ॥

Bála kaṇḍ.

Or: र किरोट दशकन्धर केरे ॥

High Hindí: ये किरोट है दशकन्धर के ॥

Lanká kaṇḍ.

An example of कर occurs in the following verse:

सो सुग्रीव केर लघु धावन ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí: वह सुग्रीव का छोटा धावक है ॥

Lanká kaṇḍ.

A contemporary of Tulsí Dás was Súra Dás (about 1650, A. D.). The following instances of the use by him of the same words (केरो or केरा, केरी, केरे) are taken from his poems called the Súra Ságar—

को तेरा पुत्र पिता तू काको मिथ्या भ्रम जग केरो ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí : कौन तेरा पुत्र पिता तू किसका, यह मिथ्या भ्रम जगत् का है ॥
Saravali 12.

Or : भरोसा दृढ इन चरनन केरो ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí : भरोसा दृढ है इन चरनों का ॥

Saravali.

Or : भजिले भिरभोर नाथहीं सकल सुखद केरो ॥

High Hindí : पूजन कर भिर भोर नाथ को सकल सुख देनेवालों की ॥

Nitya Kirtan, 49.

Considerably older than both Tulsí Dás and Súra Dás is *Kabír*. He lived about 1500, A. D. His *Rekhtahs* offer many instances of the use of केरा, केरी, केरे, as signs of the genitive. A few of them are the following :

सूकर खान के जन्मै धरई ।

जा गुरु केरी निन्दा करई ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí : सूकर और कुत्ते के जन्म को धरेगा ।

जा गुरु की निन्दा करेगा ॥

Or : आखर केरे वपत् में बन्दे किसका करौगे दीदार ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí : अन्त के काल में हे बन्दे किसका करौगे दर्शन ॥

Still further back we come to *Chand Bardai*, who lived about 1200, A. D. An instance of the same use of केरे occurs in the following verse taken from his great epic the *Prithiráj ráyasá*.

दौरे गज अन्ध चञ्चवान केरो ॥

Book XIX, 41.*

If we now turn to the *Prákrit*, we find sometimes an adjective noun केरिक्, or केरक, inserted between the genitive and the noun qualified by it. In such cases, the insertion appears to be perfectly *pleonastic*, that is, the sense is complete, even if the word केरिक्, or केरक, be altogether omitted. Whenever केरक is thus inserted, it agrees with the qualified noun in case, number, and gender, *i. e.*, is treated as an adjective ; *e. g.*,

* Unfortunately I have been unable to obtain a copy of Chand's epic, and, therefore, must content myself with giving this single example, which by a happy accident occurs in one of the notes appended by Mr. Beamos to his translation of the 19th Book, printed in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Part I, No. III, of 1869. As I have not the context, I cannot speak with certainty ; but my suggestion as to the nature of केरो might perhaps be a solution of the difficulty which Mr. Beamos felt in the meaning of the verse. It might explain the verse, without taking केरो as a verb and altering it into केरो, which is an objectionable emendation ; for there is (as Mr. Beamos himself admits) no verb केषाँ in Hindí ; and the words "to overthrow" in such a connection are an anglicism.

तुमं पि अय्यणो केरिक् जादिं ण सुमरेसि ॥

Skr. त्वम् अपि आत्मनः जातिं न स्मरसि ॥

High Hindí : तू भी अपनी जाति को नहीं स्मरण करता है ॥

Mrichchhakati, Act VI.

Or : मम केरकेण भच्चपरिव्यएण पारलोद्धो भत्ता अण्णेषीअदि ॥

Skr. मदीयेन भक्तपरिव्ययेन पारलौकिको भर्ता अन्वियते ॥

High Hindí : मेरे भात का खर्च करके परलोक सम्बन्धी स्वामी खोजा जाता है ॥

Ditto, Act I.

Or : कस्स केरकं एदं प्रवहणं ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. कस्य एतत् प्रवहणम् ॥

High Hindí : किस का है यह प्रवहण ॥

Ditto, Act VI.

Or : मम केलकं पुप्फकलंडकं जिञ्जुज्जाणं पवेसिअ ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. मदीयं पुष्पकरण्डकं जीर्णाद्यानं प्रविश्य ॥ or

High Hindí : मेरे पुष्पकरण्डक पुराने बगीचे में प्रवेश करके ॥

Ditto, Act VIII.

Or : जदि मम केलिका वद्धवाल्लिआ, ता चिद्धु दाव मुहूर्त्तम् ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. यदि मदीया वध्यपालिका, तदा तिष्ठतु तावत् मुहूर्त्तम् ॥ or

High Hindí : यदि मेरी मारने की पारी है तो ठहर जाए मुहूर्त्त भर ॥

Ditto, Act X.

In the two last examples, the common interchange of र and ल has taken place.

It may be noted in the foregoing examples, (1) that in none of them केरक (or केरिक्) has a *predicative* sense. Were we to translate it by "made or wrought," it would turn the sentence into nonsense. It is every where perfectly superfluous, the sense being complete without it; (2) that केरक is used *pleonastically*, namely, that although inserted only in connection with a *genitive*, it is not yet used by itself to determine the genitive, but always employed over and above the ordinary genitive, hence forming a sort of double or *pleonastic* genitive; (3) that केरक is used in connection with *pronouns*. Compare in this respect the use of कर in Gaṅwārī with pronouns only. There are, however, instances in which केरक is also used in connexion with nouns; *e. g.*,

एभो क्लु अलङ्कारओ अज्जआ केरओ ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. एष खलु अलङ्कारः आर्यायाः ॥ or

High Hindí : यह तो भूषण है अर्या का ॥

Ditto, Act IV.

Or : एभो क्लु पवहणे अज्जचारदत्ताद्द केलके ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. एतत् खलु प्रवहणं आर्यचारदत्तस्य ॥ or

High Hindí : यह तो गाड़ी है आर्यचारदत्त की ॥

In these examples, केरक still forms a *pleonastic* genitive. But some places occur where the original genitive termination is altogether dropped, and instead केरक is joined to the *crude* base, with which it forms a *compound*, and thus determines by itself the genitive case, *e. g.*,

पेक्खदु अज्जा अच्चकेल्लके गेच्छदुचारं ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. प्रेक्षतां आर्य्यः अस्माकं गृहद्वारम् ॥ or

High Hindî : देखो आर्य्य हमारे घर का द्वार ॥

Ditto, Act IV:

Or : राजशालमंथानकेल्लकं चगे शूले चक्रमडिवट्टिञ्चं ददस्सं ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. राजशालमंथानस्य अहं शूलः चक्रपरिवृत्तिं दास्यामि ॥ or

High Hindî : राजशालमंथान का मैं मियाहो हूं गाड़ी चलाऊंगा ॥

In these examples केरक, evidently, forms no more a *pleonastic* genitive, but itself determines the genitive case of the word with which it is *compounded*, in the place of the real original case affix. It has clearly not only lost its *predicative* meaning, but has become altogether a determinative element, or a sort of affix.

But what was originally the meaning of this word केरक, and how did it come to lapse into the condition of a mere affix? In order to answer this question, we must go back to the Sanskrit. In one place पकेल्लक occurs *instead* of केरक, *viz.* :—

तुह पकेल्लके पवहणे जेण तुमं अगगदो अहिलुहसि ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. तव प्रकृतं प्रवहणं येन त्वं अग्रतोऽधिरोहसि ॥ or

High Hindî : यह तेरी अपनी गाड़ी है कि तू आगे चढ़ता है ॥

The Sanskrit equivalent of पकेल्लक is प्रकृत.* The noun प्रकृति means 'nature,' that which distinguishes one from another. Hence, प्रकृति may mean, natural, peculiar, or *own*; for what is peculiar to one, that is one's *own*. The word पकेल्लक therefore means *own*, and was originally inserted after the genitive to emphasize the *possessive* sense of the genitive. But in course of time, this original object of the insertion of पकेल्लक was lost sight of, and it was used simply to express the genitive itself. In fact, it may be shown that the genitive in many other languages arose by some such process.† As

* Literally it is प्रकृतक; but it is a very common practice in Prākṛit, of which numberless instances are found in the plays, to add the affix क् to Sanskrit words without any effect upon the sense of the latter (cf. Pr. Prak. iv, 25, Com.).

† A good illustration of the process is mentioned by Max Müller in his Lectures on the Science of Languages. In Lect. II, page 79, he quotes the following remarks from an American paper about the Negro-English. "As to *Cases*, I do not know that I ever heard a regular possessive, but they have begun to develop one of their own, which is a very curious illustration of the way inflectional forms have probably grown up in other languages. If they wish to make the fact of possession at all emphatic or distinct, they use the whole word "own." Thus they will say "Mosey house." But if asked whose house that is, the answer is "Mosey own." "Co' Molsy y'own" was the

प्रकृत is the original of पकेलक, so कृत is the original of केरक (or केलक); and कृत (केरक) has the same meaning as प्रकृत (or पकेलक), just as कर means the same as प्रकर *door*, and कार in the phrases इत्यस् कारस्, कथस् कारस्, &c., (cf. Siddhānta Kaumudī to Pan. 3, 4, 27, Vol. II, page 468) the same as प्रकार "manner."

But to return to the phonetic changes which केरक underwent, it is well known rule in Prākṛit, that non-initial single mute consonants are elided (cf. Prākṛita Prakāṣa II, 2.). Accordingly केर becomes केरञ्चो, a form which occurs in several of the examples already quoted. When two vowels meet in consequence of such an elision of a consonant, they are often contracted, in Prākṛit already (cf. Pr. Prak. IV. 1.), but still more in its descendant, the Gaurian. Hence केरञ्चो becomes in the Gaurian केरो, and this again changes into केरा. Thus the Sanskrit घोटकः, horse, is in Prākṛit घोडञ्चो, in the Gaurian घोड़ा (Alwari and Sindhi), or घोड़ा (High Hindi). On the change of the final चो to चा, as well as the change of the feminine termination चा to ई in केरो, see some remarks below and in Essay IV.

From केरा (or केरो), केरी, केरे, may be derived immediately the modern forms का (or को), को, क, by another step of phonetic decay. The elision of a medial र, though not noted in the Sūtras of Vararuchi, occurs occasionally in the later Prākṛit; *e. g.*, पइ, for परि, in

अकलिअपइरभविष्ममाइ ।

नमइ अणंगरइणो मोइणइ ॥ *i. e.*

Sanskrit, अकलितपरिरभविष्ममाणि ।

नसतानङ्गरत्योशोइणानि ॥

Karpūra Manjarī Saṭṭaka, verse 2.

But in the Gaurian the elision of a medial single र is not without example. For instance, the conjunction पै, *but*, clearly stands for the Sanskrit परम्, which occurs in Hindi also, and more commonly as पर. Similarly, the Gauwari sign of the genitive कै has arisen from the other Gauwari and poetic form कर. Another Hindi word कर (करि) which, however, has a different origin and stands for the Prākṛit करिञ्च (Sanskrit कृत्वा), also becomes not uncommonly कै, especially in the older poets like Kabir, *e. g.*,

कहेो भाव कैसे कै जानी सत्य बचन कैसे कै मानो ॥ or

High Hindi, कहेो अभिप्राय कैसे करि जानूँ सच्चो वात कैसे करि मानूँ ॥

There is no great difficulty, therefore, in deriving का, को, के, from केरा, केरी; केरे, still another derivation is possible which I shall presently give, and

odd reply made by a little girl to the question, whose child she was carrying. Co' is little; y euphonic."—I think also, it can be shown that the affix स्य, by means of which many Sanskrit genitives are formed, is nothing else but a possessive pronominal base, equivalent to the common possessive pronominal base स्व, meaning "own."

which is not open to this difficulty. Before, however, proceeding to the consideration of it, I will dispose of another genitive post-position which, there appears little doubt, is really derived from कौरा and thus medially from the Prákrit कौरको, viz. the Bangálí genitive post-position एर, and the Bangálí and Oriya र.

In Bangálí, all adjectives which are derived through the Prákrit appear in the *crude base* (that is without the Prákrit endings को [masculine] or या or ई [feminine] and anuswára [neuter]), and hence are alike in all genders and cases, e. g., कोट बालक, little boy, and कोट बालिका, little girl (cf. Shama Churn Sircár's Bangálí Grammar, page 75, 2nd edition). Hence the Prákrit कौरको or contracted कौरा, would in Bangálí become कौर. Now this form कौर occurs now and then in Tulsi Dás, who, in his *Ramáyana*, has laid all the principal Gaurian languages, and Bangálí among them, under contribution. An instance of a verse containing it, has been already quoted. I have above referred to the Prákrit rule of eliding a medial single mute consonant. The term medial includes also the initial consonant of a word which forms the last part of a compound (cf. Pr. Prak. II, 2); e. g., Sanskrit सुपुरुषः becomes in Prákrit सुउरिषो; Sanskrit कुम्भकारः becomes in Pr. prak. कुम्भारो, in Gaurian कुम्हार; Sanskrit चर्मकारः becomes Prákrit चर्मारो, Gaurian चमार. I have also shown that, though in Prákrit कौरक is generally used *pleonastically*, so that its concomitant word is also in the genitive case, yet in some instances it is made to form a compound with its concomitant word which then drops its genitive inflexion. This latter usage seems to have become exclusively established in the Bangálí, and in using कौर in composition with the word in the genitive case, the initial क of the former is elided regularly. Thus we arrive at एर. Take for instance the genitive of सन्तान, a child; it would be सन्तान कौरको, this would change to सन्तानकौर, and this to सन्तानएर, or (by contraction of the two adjoining vowels) सन्तानैर, which is the present genitive in Bangálí. By analogy, the other Bangálí genitive post-position र, which it shares with the Oriya, is probably a curtailment of the genitive sign कर, still occurring in Tulsi Dás and in the Gauwári.

It has been already noticed that the Sanskrit equivalent for the Prákrit कौरक is कृत. But कृत assumes various forms in Prákrit. Perhaps the most common, though not the most regular, form of it is किद् (where the change of ऋ to इ takes place by Pr. Prak. I, 28, and that of त to द by Pr. Prak. II, 7), e. g.,

सुदु दे किद् ॥=Sanskrit सुदु ते कृतम् ॥

Or : अचकिद् विस्तुमलेदि ॥=Sanskrit अपकृतम् विस्तरति ॥

Or : एवं किदे किं भोदि ॥=Sanskrit एवं कृते किं भवति ॥

Next comes the form कद्, formed regularly according to Pr. Prak. I, 27, and II, 7, e. g.,

पलिचालके कद्वि ॥=Sanskrit परिचारकः कृतोऽस्मि ॥

O: सुट्टु मए कदं ॥=Sanskrit सुट्टु मया कतस् ॥

The most regular form, though not so frequent, is कच with change of चट to अच by Pr. Prak. I, 28, and elision of त by Pr. Prak. II, 2., in both of which sūtras it is given among the examples. Another not unfrequent form is कड, (Pr. Prak. XI, 15), in which the त् of क्तन under the influence of चट has changed to ड, a change not uncommon in Prākrit, as in पडिसरे, for प्रतिसरः, (Pr. Prak. II, 8, 28.), वुड्डो for वृद्ध; शिलु पडदि for शिरः पतति, (Mricchh. Act II page 62). Examples of कड are—

शलपलिवने कडे ॥=Sanskrit खरपरिचितिः कता ॥

अदे गये कडे ॥=Sanskrit अर्दगण्डः कतः ॥ etc.

Another very rare form is कल, where the ल may be a substitution either for the ड of कड (by Pr. Prak. II, 23, as दालिमं for दाडिमम्, कोलन्ह for क्रोडामः, Ratnāwali, Act I, page 21), or for the द् of कद (by analogy of Pr. Prak. II, 12, as कलम्यो for कदम्यः); it occurs, *e. g.*, in कलेनिचए ॥=Sanskrit कता निचय ॥. From the form कल probably sprang the form केल, which occurs only in the augmented shape केलक, by the not uncommon substitution of an ए for the first अ (cf Pr. Prak. I, 5, as सेज्जा for शय्या, तेराचे for त्रयोदश, परेन् for पर्यन्तम्, &c.). The most extraordinary transformation of क्तन, however, is the rare one कुलु which occurs, *e. g.*, in अलेगन्यकुलु=Sanskrit अरे गण्डः कतः (Mricchh. Act II, page 63). From either कल or कड, by the easy change of the linguals or ल into र (cf. Pr. Prak. II, 30), arose a further form कर; unless it be considered itself the original of कल, which is equally possible; or कर might also be derived direct from कद; cf. Pr. Prak. II, 13, 14. The same relation as केलक to कल, केरक bears to कर; and as कर is to कल, so केरक is to केलक. The form कर (as an indeclinable adjective like those in Bangālī) has been used, as already shown, in the vulgar and poetical Hindi, to express the genitive. And from it, as also explained already, probably the Bangālī and Oriya genitive sign र is derived, by the elision of the consonant क् and loss of the vowel अ through the contraction of the meeting vowels consequent upon that elision; *e. g.*, घोड़ा कर = घोड़ाचर = घोड़ार.*

The other forms किद or कद or कच are, I think, the originals of the different modern Hindi post-positions का or कौ or को and their feminine की and inflected के. As the Prākrit केरको becomes (by elision of क्) केरओ, and this again in the Gaurian (by contraction of the meeting vowels) केरा or केरा, so the Prākrit कदेओ becomes कओ, and this in the Gaurian को or कौ or का. As regards this final आ of का which corresponds to the masculine ending आ of all adjectives which have come into the Hindi through the Prākrit, it is every-

* Perhaps the possessive in Hindi मेरा, तेरा, तिहार, हमारा, तुम्हारा, &c., should be explained by means of this element (र for र्), the curtailment of कर (or करर्), thus तुम्हारा Sanskrit युष्मत् कतः—Prākrit तुम्ह केरको; for the commonly received derivation of these pronouns from the Sanskrit possessiva मदीय, त्वदीय, युष्मदीय, &c., is not without difficulties.

where the substitute of the Prākṛit masculine nominative ending **ओ**. Adjective bases in **अ** end in Sanskrit in the nominative singular masculine in **अः**, feminine **आ** or **ई**, plural **आः**. These terminations change in the Prākṛit in **ओ**, **आ** or **ई**, and **आ**. In the Alwarī dialect, as well as in the Sindhi and Naipāli, these terminations are preserved unchanged. The genitive postpositions in Alwarī and Naipāli are, nominative singular masculine **को**, nominative plural masculine **का**, feminine **की**; in Sindhi resp. **जा**, **जा**, **जो**; similarly, in all three languages, **घोड़ो** is a horse, **घोड़ा** horses, **घोड़ी** mare, &c. The Brajbhāshā changes generally the Prākṛit **ओ** into **औ**, and has therefore **कौ**, instead of **को**; similarly **कछौ**, for Prākṛit **कच्छिओ** (Sanskrit कथितः). The High Hindi finally changes the harsher diphthongs **ओ** or **औ** into the more agreeable vowel **आ**, and hence has **का**, **कहा** for **को** or **कौ**, **कच्छिओ** or **कछौ**. From **को** (or **कौ** or **का**) the feminine **की** was formed, according to the universal rule of the Hindi of forming the feminine in **ई**, instead of the Sanskrit or Prākṛit **आ**. The origin of the feminine **की** and the inflected form **के** will be explained afterwards (see Essay IV).

The form **किद्** perhaps has even a better claim than the form **कद्** to be considered the original of **का**, **की**, **के**. It is true that so far as I have searched the Prākṛit dialogues of Sanskrit dramas, I have not discovered an instance of either **कदो** or **किदो** being used in that *pleonastic* manner in which **केरको** is employed. While **केरको** is frequently used in a determinative sense (as affix of the genitive), I have never found **कदो** or **किदो** so used, but always in a predicative sense (as a proper participle past passive). But besides the direct proofs to be adduced hereafter (showing that **किदो** is the original of **के**), the following reasons will show that not much importance can be attached to the circumstance. In the first place, that no instance of **किदो** or **कदो** as genitive affix is found, is merely matter of accident. For altogether the use of a Prākṛit form of the Sanskrit participle **कृत** in this determinative sense, is confined to *one* play, the Mricchhakaṭi; and even there it occurs only about fourteen times (in the form **केरक**). This use of **कृत** was evidently *slang*. But while other plays also introduce low and vulgar people, they do it only on rare occasions and even then put a more or less refined language into their mouth; on the other hand, the Mricchhakaṭi introduces low people very extensively, and allows them to express themselves freely in their native vulgar jargon. This explains also the occurrence, in the Mricchhakaṭi, of other grammatical forms besides **केरक**, which are found in no other play. We may safely conclude that since the use of a Prākṛit form of **कृत** to determine the genitive is confined to one play and even there, on account of its vulgarity, is only exceptionally introduced, the manner of its use there must not be taken as a measure of its use in general among the people. Among them, **केरक** was employed, no doubt, much more frequently, and very probably other forms of **कृत** (as **कद्**, **किद्**, &c.) also, which were too vulgar to be admit-

ted at all into any play. There is nothing surprising in the fact that, among only about fourteen instances of केरक, the form किदे or कद should never occur, seeing that the latter was probably the more vulgar expression of the two. And here I may call attention to the oft-observed fact that what had been once vulgar or slang phrases, or grammatical forms, during the classical period of a language, generally becomes the material out of which the language after its decay reconstructs itself. This law is well illustrated by the Romance languages. "The sources of Italian are not to be found in the classical Literature of Rome, but in the popular dialects of Italy. Hindústání is not the daughter of Sanskrit, as we find it in the Vedas, or in the later literature of the Bráhmans; it is a branch of the living speech of India, springing from the same stem from which Sanskrit sprang, when it first assumed its literary independence."* (2.) Moreover, there is direct proof that किदे and कदे were used in a determinative sense. In Sanskrit, कृते, the locative singular of कृत, is sometimes employed to express the dative. Even there it has nearly lost its originally predicative meaning, and has come to be regarded almost like a mere case-affix. But in the Prakrit and Gaurian, कृते as well as other similar Sanskrit words, *e. g.*, अर्थे (Maráthi अर्थी), मकारे (Bangáli काहे, Hindí कहें), have become mere case—signs of the dative. Now कृते is rendered in the Prakrit promiscuously by केरके (or केरक'), or by किदे, or by कद. Examples of केरक are the following—

दृजे तस्म केरकं ति कथं तुमं जाणामि ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. हे चेष्टि तस्य कृते इति कथं त्वं जानामि ॥ or

High Hindí : हे चेष्टि कि उस के लिये (आया है) यह तू कैसे जानती है ॥

Or : अज्जए अत्तकेरकं वि ण जाणामि ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. आर्य्ये आत्मनः कृतेऽपि न जानामि ॥ or

High Hindí : ह आर्य्या कि अपने लिये (आया है) यह भी मैं नहीं जानती हूं ।
Mriehchhakaṭi.

Or : एसे कस्म केरके प्रवचणे ति ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. एष कस्य कृते प्रवचण इति ॥ or

High Hindí : यह गाड़ी किस के लिये है ॥

Or : एसे राजशालसंठाणकेलके प्रवचणे ति ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. एष राजशालसंस्थानस्य कृते प्रवचण इति ॥ or

High Hindí : यह गाड़ी राजा के साला संस्थान के लिये है ॥

Ditto, Act. VI. page, 186.

Examples of किदे are—

कस्य किदे अहं आचदा ॥ *i. e.*

* Max Müller, Lectures on the Science of Language, Lect. II., page 67. The greater part of that lecture (pp. 50 to 80) is devoted to this subject of what M. M. calls "dialectic regeneration."

Skr. कस्य हतेचहम् आगता ॥ or

High Hindí: किस के लिये मैं आयी हूँ ॥

Ratnávalí, Act II, page 57.

Or: कोस तुमं भिविण्णअदंसणमेत्तकस्सुकिदे सन्नापसि ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. कस्मात् त्वं खमद्दर्शनमात्रस्य हते.... सन्नापसे ॥ or

High Hindí: क्यूं तू केवल खम देखने के लिये ... पश्चात्ताप करती है ॥

Venisambhára, Act II. page. 35.

An example of कदे is the following—

कथं मम मन्दभाङ्गीए कदे अज्जचालुद्धे वावादीअदि ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. कथं मम मन्दभागिन्याः हते आर्य्यचारुदत्तो व्यापाद्यते ॥ or

High Hindí: कैसे मुझ अमागो के लिये आर्य्यचारुदत्त मारा जाता है ॥

Mrichehkhakāṭi, Act X. page 323.

It is more than probable then, that if किदे, or कदे, was used beside करक, to express the dative, किदे or कदे was also employed beside करको, to express the genitive. And I think it not impossible, that a more careful and extensive examination of Prākṛit and the earliest Gaurian literature, might bring to light instances of the use of किदे or कदे as affixes of the genitive.

But to proceed with the consideration of किदे. By the usual elision of the *medial* mute consonant, the form कियो would arise. This is, indeed, the usual form in which the participle हत appears in the earlier Hindí poets (especially Súra Dás), where it is written कियो, with a slight accommodation to the pronunciation to avoid the hiatus. Generally, however, in such cases the vowel इ before यो is changed to the corresponding semivowel य; *e. g.*, Sanskrit रहितः = Prākṛit रहियो = Hindí रह्यो; Sanskrit कथितः = Prākṛit कहियो = Hindí कह्यो, &c., and in the Brajbhāshá रह्यो, कह्यो, etc. Accordingly, कियो would become क्यो, and in the Braj Bhāshá क्यो. The reason why it is changed to कियो (or कियौ) is simply euphonism, an initial double consonant being difficult to pronounce. But when in other words (रह्यो, कह्यो) the double consonant would be medial and hence divisible between the two enclosing syllables, it is not avoided; and for the same reason the word कियो itself, when it is compounded with a prefix, is spelt क्यो in the Naipālī; *e. g.*, जब उ बाहिर निस्क्यो = Hindí जब बह बाहिर निकला (= S. निःद्यतः). This is but the application of a well known Sanskrit Sandhi rule, according to which, *e. g.*, रि + अति = रियति; गु + अति = गुवति, but शिरो + ए = शिश्ये, भानु + योः = भान्वाः (cf. Siddh. Kaum. to Pan. 6, 4, 77, 64, 82, page 118.) Now when कियो is used to express the genitive, it is no more an independent word, but has sunk down to the position of an affix, and forms a compound with its concomitant word. Hence, क्य would have a medial position and, therefore, would not be avoided. Hence कियो, when used as a sort of genitive affix, would be contracted into क्यो (or क्यौ).

Lastly क्यो would, for reasons of euphony, be contracted into को (or कौ or का); just as the harsher forms रह्यो or रह्यौ, कह्यो or कह्यौ, &c., of the Braj

Bhāshā are contracted in the High Hindī into the more euphonious रहा, कहा, &c.. The following scheme will make the similarity still more manifest to the eye—

Sanskrit.	Prākrit.	Br. Bhāshā.	Hindī.	
(कथितः), (क-)थितः	== (क-)द्धिदो	== (क-)द्धिओ	== (क-)द्धौ	== (क-)द्दा
(रहितः), (र-)हितः	== (र-)द्धिदो	== (र-)द्धिओ	== (र-)द्धौ	== (र-)द्दा
(मारितः), (मा-)रितः	== (मा-)रिदो	== (मा-)रिओ	== (मा-)र्यौ	== (मा-)रा
(लग्नितः), (ल-)ग्नितः	== (ल-)ग्निदो	== (ल-)ग्निओ	== (ला-)ग्न्यौ	== (ला-)गा
(कृतः), (-)कृतः	== (-)कृदो	== (-)कृओ	== (-)क्यौ	== (-)का

A still more exact parallel, than by these examples, is afforded by the Hindī या (feminine थी, plural ये), the past tense of the auxiliary verb होना, to be. For the original of या is स्थितः, the Sanskrit past participle of the verb स्था, to stand. The initial स् is dropped, as usual in Prakrit; likewise the medial त्; thus we arrive at थियो; and this may change either to थियो, which would be exactly parallel to the Braj Bhāshā कियो, or to थ्यो, which would be exactly parallel to the form क्वा, assumed by me as the *immediate* original of कौ (का). Now both थियो and थ्यो occur in the Naipālī, and are there the simultaneous equivalents of the Hindī या; *e. g.*,

उसको नाउँ अलीसवा थियो । *i. e.*

High Hindī : उसका नाम अलीसवा था । St. Luko i, 5.

Again : ई दुवै विधि मा निर्दोष थ्या । *i. e.*

High Hindī : ये दोनों विधि में निर्दोष थे । St. Luko i, 6.

Again : ई दुवै धेर वर्ष का थिया । *i. e.*

High Hindī : ये दोनों बहुत वर्ष के थे । St. Luko i, 7.

In the case of या, therefore, we can still follow its descent, step by step, from the Sanskrit स्थितः, through थिदो, थिओ, थियो, थ्यो, to या; while in the case of का unfortunately some of the links have been lost. But that कौ, or का, is really a direct descendant of the Sanskrit कृतः, just as या of स्थितः, is even more remarkably proved by the Naipālī; for in one case it actually makes use of कौ (feminine कौ, plural का) as a substitute of कृतः. The Naipālī, namely, possesses two forms of the past participle passive; one is the ordinary form, which it shares with all other Gaurian languages; the other is a very peculiar *pleonastic* form, which I believe only one other Gaurian language, *viz.*, the Marāthī, possesses. The difference between those two forms appears to be this, that the participle takes the common form, whenever it is used *actively* to denote the past tense active, and the *pleonastic* form whenever it is used *passively* as a participial adjective. The *pleonastic* form is made by superadding the past participle कृतः, contracted to कौ, to the common form of the past participle passive, and of the two participles, thus compounded, the latter cannot be inflected, whereas the former (*i. e.*, कौ) takes the inflexions, and agrees with the qualified noun in gender, number, and case,

(*i. e.*, masculine को, feminine को, plural and oblique का); *e. g.*, the past participle passive of लेखना, to write, used to form the perfect tense *active*, is लेख्यो (*i. e.*, Sans. लिखितः); but with the proper *passive* sense, it is लेख्या को (*i. e.* Sanskrit लिखितः कृतः, or Hindi लिखा हुआ or गया), thus “the Gospel written by Luke” is लूकले लेख्या को शुभसमाचार (*i. e.* Sanskrit लूकेन लिखितः कृतः शुभसमाचारः or Hindi : लूकसे लिखा हुआ सुसमाचार); but “Luke wrote a Gospel” is लूकले लेख्यो शुभसमाचार (*i. e.*, Sanskrit लूकेन लिखितः शुभसमाचारः, or Hindi लूक ने लिखा शुभसमाचार). A few other examples are: कोहि सहर नासरा भन्या का मा परमेश्वर वाट दूत पठाया को थियो *i. e.*, High Hindi कोई नगर नासरा कचे ऊए में प. वाट दूत भेजा गया था (Lit. Sanskrit कस्यापि नगरस्य नासरा भणितस्य कृतस्य मध्ये परमेश्वरसमीपात् दूतः प्रस्थापितः कृतः स्थितः) St. Luke i, 26, 27. Again, उ एक मानिस मित वाग्दत्त भया की थिई, *i. e.*, High Hindi वह एक मनुष्य के साथ वाग्दत्त भयो गयी थी (or Sanskrit सा.....भता कृता स्थिता) St. Luke i, 27. Again, तेरे बिनो सुन्या को ह *i. e.*, High Hindi तेरा बिनय सुना गया है (or Sanskrit श्रुतः कृतोऽस्ति) St. Luke i, 14. Again, उ बाँझा भन्या को को यो बैटा महीना भयो *i. e.*, High Hindi वह बाँझ कही हुई का बटा महीना हुआ. In this last example, the participle को and the genitive affix को are side by side.*

Whichever be thought the more probable derivation of का, either from कद् or किद्—and this can only be decided after a more thorough examination of the earliest Gaurian literature—I hope, I have succeeded in proving so much beyond doubt, that the Sanskrit participle कृत is in one form or the other the original of the genitive post-positions.

There remains briefly to consider the post-positions in the other Gaurian languages. In the case of most of them my remarks are not meant to be

* A very similar, though not quite so parallel case is that of भा, a past participle of हाना, to be, which still occurs in the Ganwári, and is also met with now and then in Tulsi Dás. It stands for the High Hindi ऊँच्य (Sanskrit भूतः), and the Low Hindi भवा, or भया. It occurs, for instance, in the following verse of Tulsi Dás,

अव मोहिं भा भरोस हनुमन्ता ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindi: अव मुझे ऊँच्य भरोसा है हनुमान् ॥

Sundar kāṇḍ.

भा is a curtailment of the Low Hindi भवा or भया, which are both probably derived from a Prākṛit भविदे (for Sanskrit भूतः). From भविदे, by the elision of द्, would come भविथो, भयो, भवा, and from the same, by the elision of both द् and व, would come भद्थो = भया = भया. Another parallel case, I believe, we have in the syllable गा (feminine गो, plural गे), which forms the Hindi future tense; *e. g.*, होगा, he will be. For it stands probably for गया, the Hindi past participle of जाना, to go; and गया itself is connected with the Sanskrit गतः, and Prākṛit गथा or (with insertion of an euphonia य्) गथो. Compare also पा in the Low Hindi phrase पा जाना, to be found, for पाया जाना, and का, the Low Hindi for क्या, what?

more than suggestions of their probable origin, founded partly on the fact of the common origin of all Gaurian languages, partly on Prākṛit analogies.

In the Marāṭhī genitive post-positions चा, ची, चे, a simple transformation of the guttural क् of का, की, के into a palatal च has taken place. For the rest they must be derived from the Sanskrit क्त in the same manner as का, की, के. There is only one other instance known to me in Marāṭhī of such a change of gutturals and palatals: it is that of the Sanskrit किरातः barbarian into the Mahārāshṭri चिलादे which is the subject of a special rule in the Prākṛita Prakāsa (II. 33.) But the change is physiologically very easy (cf. Max Müller, *Science of Languages* Lect. III, page, 155 vol. 2nd), and by no means uncommon in the Aryan languages in general (cf. Bopp, *Comp. Gram.* § 14 page 25).*

The origin of the Panjābī, Sindhī and Gujarātī post-positions I explain alike, in a manner similar to that in which I have explained the Bangālī and Oṛiya post-positions र and एर; viz. that they have originated from a Prākṛit form of क्त by the elision of the initial consonant क and contraction (by *Sandhi*) of the two adjoining vowels.

The original of the Panjābī post-positions दा, दी, दे is the form कदे or किदे; probably the latter.† Take for instance the genitive of घोड़ा horse. It may be assumed to have been originally घोड़े किदे.‡ Here the original

* I had written the above remarks when I received a copy of the Student's Manual of Marāṭhī Grammar. In the appendix on the grammatical forms which occur in *old Marāṭhī poetry*, a few forms are given which confirm my theory in a remarkable way. The old form of the masculine चा and the neuter चे is there (page 138) stated to be resp. चिया and चिये. Now चिया represents a Prākṛit form चियो and is the very form which, a few pages back, I postulated as the immediate original of the Hindi का (taking क् and च् to be interchangeable letters) and about which I expressed a hope that a more thorough examination of the oldest Gaurian literature might bring to light traces of it. I, there, derived का (or चा) thus: Sanskrit क्तः; Prākṛit किदे = कियो (or चियो) = either किदे (or चियो) or क्ये (or च्ये) = का (or चा).—The derivation of चा (in the same grammar page 132) from the Sanskrit genitive affix स्य is untenable. 1stly, because even if स्य could be the original of चा, it certainly could not be so of the older form चियो. 2ndly. The Sanskrit स्य is unchangeable, while चा is capable of forming case, number, and gender. 3rdly. Against the Sanskrit derivative affix त्य as well as against the inflexional affix स्य all those objections lie which I have pointed out with reference to the derivation of the Hindi का from the Sanskrit affix क् or कीय.

† The Panjābī dictionary of the Lodiáná Mission gives a form दिचा, a preposition or genitive particle. If this can be trusted, it would seem to indicate that the initial द् of the Panjābī post-positions is a modification of the original क् of किदे. See on this interchange of the guttural and dental class, Bopp's *Comparative Grammar*, § 401.

‡ I must reserve the explanation of the inflected form घोड़े for another paper.

meaning of कियो was no more felt; it had become like a mere affix and had assumed an *enclitic* position, forming *one* word with घोड़े. Hence, as in compound words, the (now medial) consonant क was elided, and the two adjoining vowels ए + इ contracted (by dropping इ); thus we have घोड़े इदे = घोड़े दे. Finally as in High Hindi the harsh diphthong औ was changed to the more agreeable vowel आ; thus घोड़े दा. The process here assumed is well illustrated by the origin of the interrogative pronoun कौन who. In Prākṛit the interrogative pronoun को (= Sanskrit कः) has almost invariably appended to it, the *enclitic* पुनर्; thus को पुनर्; here the consonant ए is always elided; thus को उण; in the Gaurian again the two adjoining vowels औ + उ are contracted (by dropping उ), thus कौन.*

The Sindhi post-positions जा, जो, जे, जा may have originated from the form कियो (= कियो = कियो), by exactly the same process as explained above in the case of दा; thus घोड़े कियो = घोड़े द्यो = घोड़े यो. Finally the initial semivowel य of यो would change, according to a general rule of the Prākṛit (P. P. II, 31) and Gaurian, into the palatal consonant ज; thus घोड़े जा.†

The Gujarātī post-positions ने (नी, नुं, etc.) I am inclined to derive from an obsolete Prākṛit form of क्तत, *viz.* कियो or कुषो in the same way as the Panjābī दा from कियो, or the Sindhi जा from कियो. That such a Prākṛit form must have once existed, is clearly proved by the Hindi. In poetry, an old Hindi form कान्हा or कौना often occurs equivalent to क्तत: made or done. Two other old Hindi past participial forms, exactly analogous to them, also occur in poetry, *viz.* दीन्हा or दीना given (= Sanskrit दत्तः) and लौन्हा or लौना taken (= Sanskrit लब्धः).‡ Now the derivation of दीना is well assured

Here I will only say that I consider the termination ए to be a modification of the Sanskrit genitive termination अस्स्य (of bases in अ), which in Prākṛit becomes अस्स (or आस or आह) or से. The entailment of कियो or कियो into देा must be supposed to have taken place contemporaneously with the modification of the Prākṛit termination आस or आह or से into the Gaurian ए (Hindi, Panjābī, Sindhi) or आ (Mar. Gujar.).

* A Prākṛit lingual ए generally changes into the dental न in Hindi. In the Alwar dialect the pronoun is still कौण; in the Ganwāri and in Hindi poetry (e. g. of Chand Bardai) it is कवन; compare in Marāṭhī चवथ fourth for the Prākṛit चउथ. It may be noticed also that the vowels इ and उ which are elided, are preceded by their own corresponding diphthongs ए and औ.

† The Sindhi post-positions admit, however, also of a different explanation. Their initial ज् might be merely a softening of the initial च् which we have in the Marāṭhī. As a somewhat parallel case we may compare the Nipālī कौ (they are), to which corresponds in the Low Hindi of Alwar कौ and in High Hindi कौ (i. e. Sanskrit सन्ति).

‡ Of these pairs those containing the ह are later and occur generally in Tulsi

According to the Prākṛit Prakāṣa VIII, 62, the participial past passive of the root दा to give is in Prākṛit दिष् (for Sanskrit दत्त) and from दिष् by a regular process of phonetic modification, which I shall explain later on, the form दीन* originated. By analogy it follows that the other two forms कोना and लौना must also be derived from original Prakrit forms क्किष् and लिष् (of the roots क्क and ल्). It is true that neither क्किष् nor लिष् are supported by any of Vararuchi's Sūtras, nor by the Prākṛit of the plays founded upon those Sūtras. But as the process of phonetic change was certainly not stopped by Vararuchi's Sūtras, the phase of Prākṛit exhibited in his Sūtras cannot be taken as a measure of what Prākṛit may have been at a much later period. There is not the least difficulty, therefore, in assuming that the Prākṛit of later times and perhaps among the vulgar, contained many forms which have not found admittance in Vararuchi's Sūtras or in dramatic Prākṛit. Among those later or more vulgar forms क्किष् and लिष् must have been.† Their existence is necessary to account for the existence of the

Dās. Tho others without ह् are the more original ones and occur for example in Kabīr Chand; e. g.,

जेहि मुनीश जो आयसु दीन्हा ।

सो जनु काज प्रथम तेहि कोन्हा ॥ i. e.

High Hindī: जिस को मुनीश जो आदेश दिया ।

सो कार्य मानो पहले उस ने किया ॥

Tulsi Dās Ramāyan, Ajudhya Kāṇḍ.

Again: कारि वारि के सुपना दीना ।

कहे आई औतार हि लौना ॥ i. e.

High Hindī: जला करके सुपना दिया ।

कहता है आके औतार को लिया ॥

Kabīr, Rekhtās.

Again: गज चरम आसन कीन ।

पढी जमन वेद नवोन ॥ i. e.

High Hindī: हाथों का चर्म का आसन किया ।

य.वनों का नाया वेद पढन को ॥

Pr. Rāj Rāy., I, 11.

Again: कारन कवन भय मुनि कोनों ।

रोकि पबलि गृथै कहा लोनों ॥ i. e.

High Hindī: क्या कारण कि मुनि का भय किया ।

मार्ग रोकने को ग्रंथ क्या लिया ॥

Pr. Rāj Rāy., I, 18.

* The dental न for original ण according to general Hindī usage.

† In P. P. VIII, 13, it is stated the root क्क or क्कृ may change into कुष्; e. g. कुष्द he does for करद (= Sanskrit करोति). From कुष् a past. part. passive क्कृष् may be derived and it is not improbable, that कुष् might change into क्किष् by the analogy of दिष् just as e. g. पुरुष् man changes into पुरिस; cf. P. P. I, 23.

forms कौना and लौना which certainly do exist. From an original Prākṛit किक्षे then, through the intermediate modification कौना, I think the Gujarātī genitive post-positions ना, &c., may be derived.

Having thus explained the derivation of the various Gauṛian post-positions of the genitive, I now proceed to state another important evidence in support of my theory. I have shown that the word केरक was used in two different ways in Prākṛit to express the genitive, viz., 1st, as a mere affix, in which case it was compounded with the word which was to be put into the genitive case; 2nd, as a pleonastic insertion, in which case the word which was to be put into the genitive case, retained its organic genitive inflexion. Now I have tried to prove that the Bangālī post-positions एर and र and the Oriya post-position र are derived from the Prākṛit केरक employed in the former manner. On the other hand the Hindī post-position केरा (केरो, केरे) are derived from the same Prākṛit करक employed in the second manner and the Hindī post position का (को, के) as well as the post-positions of all Gauṛian languages of the Hindī class (*i. e.* Naipālī, Marāṭhī, Gujarātī, Sindhī, Panjābī, but exclusive of Bangālī and Oriya) are derived from the Prākṛit form किद् (किक्ष respectively), also employed in the second manner. This accounts why the initial क् was lost in Bangālī and Oriya, while it was retained in Hindī, Naipālī and Marāṭhī. It is true क् was dropped (if my derivation be true) in the Panjābī, Sindhī and Gujarātī; but this is accounted for by the circumstance that though the words किदे and किक्षे remained independent words, yet being only pleonastic, they became enclitic, and hence liable to phonetic corruption in the initial letters by contact with the principle word, on which they leant. However the main point to which I wished to call attention is this, that if my theory of explanation of the genitive post-positions of the Hindī class of the Gauṛian languages is true, it may be expected that traces of their being a pleonastic insertion, and of the existence of an organic genitive of the inflected word will have remained. A few such traces, I think, I can prove to exist, and considering the extent to which phonetic decay has gone in the modern languages of India, I think they are sufficiently distinct and remarkable.

In Hindi poetry, such combinations as तेहि केरो, तेहि को, ताहि को (all = उसका or तिसका) or केहि केरो (= किस कर) &c., are not uncommon; *e. g.*,

खर प्रभु अंग अंग कवि कहां पायो केहि केरे ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindī: हे खरप्रभु किस के अंगों में शोभा कहां पायी गयी ॥

Súra Dás, Súrságar, Rágvilása.

Or: बाघों आज तेहि को हारे ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindī: मैं बाघू आज तुम को हे लड़के ॥

Ibidem, 162.

Or: ताही के भये टाठी खोरा ताही के भये चोरा ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí: तिस के ऊर थाली कटोरा तिस के ऊर चोर ॥

Kabir's Rekhtás.

Now these forms तेहि or ताहि, केहि or काहि, जेहि or जाहि, तेहि, मोहि, &c., are nothing but phonetic corruptions of the Sanskrit genitives तस्य, कस्य, यस्य, &c. No doubt when standing by themselves they are commonly used to express the *dative* case and even any other case (ablative, instrumental, locative); but that is owing to the fact (i) that the *dative* case has disappeared altogether from the Prákrit and the Gaurian, and has been substituted by the genitive and (ii) that in poetry all case-signs (or post-positions) are generally omitted. But instances are not wanting where those forms are used even by themselves in the sense of the genitive; *e. g.*,

जाहि शस्त्र रूपी नेत्र नाहीं सो आंधरौ हे । *i. e.*

High Hindí: जिस का शस्त्र रूपी नेत्र नहीं सो अंधा हे ॥

Rájñiti, page 3.

Or: प्रभु पयात जाना बैदेही ।

फरके वाम अंग शुभ तेहो ॥ *i. e.*

High Hindí: प्रभु को यात्रा जानी सीता ने ।

फरके शुभ बाँये अंग उसके ॥

Tulsí Dás Ramáyan, Sundarkāṇḍ.

2. In the High Hindí the interrogative pronoun कौन forms its genitive किसका, the relative जो forms जिसका, the demonstrative सो forms तिसका, वह forms उसका, यह forms इसका. These forms किस, जिस, तिस, उस, इस have never been explained. The fact, however, is that they are by themselves already full genitives so that किसका, जिस का, &c., are in reality double or *pleonastic* genitives. In Prákrit there are two forms of the base of these pronouns, one ending in अ्, the other in इ (viz. क and कि, ज and जि, त and ति of which all इ bases, with the solitary exception of किस् *what* have been lost in Sanskrit). The bases कि, जि, ति, are in the Prákrit, as we know it now, restricted generally to the feminine; but that originally it was not so, is proved by the fact that in the masculine the forms किण, जिण, तिण of the instrumental case occur as alternatives besides केण, जेण, तेण. Now the genitive of the masculine bases कि, जि, ति is किस्. जिस्, तिस् (feminine किस्सा, जिस्सा, तिस्सा; for the Sanskrit कस्य, जस्य तस्य; feminine कस्या: etc. by the common rule of the Prákrit of assimilating dissimilar compound consonants, cf. P. P. III, 2.) In the modern dialects there is a general rule, that where the Sanskrit has two dissimilar consonants adjoining and the Prákrit turns these into two

similar consonants, the Gaurian elides one of the latter and lengthens the preceding vowel.* The following examples will illustrate this rule :

Sanskrit.	Prákrit.	Gaurian.	Sanskrit.	Prákrit	Gaurian.
कर्म	कम्म	काम	वार्त्ता	वत्ता	वात
कर्ण	कष	कान	अये	अगे	आगे
कार्य	कज्ज	काज	अय	अज्ज	आज
अष्ट	अट्ठ	आठ	अग्नि	अग्गि	आग
द्वस्त	द्वत्थ	दाथ	शुष्क	सुक्ख	सूख
फाल्गुन	फग्गुन	फागुन	दुग्धा	दुड	दूध
आत्मा	अप्पा	आप	etc.	etc.	etc.

But there are exceptions to this rule. One of the most common of these is *सव* all from Prákrit *सव्व* and Sanskrit *सर्व*.† The genitive *किस्र*, *जिस्र*, *तिस्र* &c., are also exceptional and become in Hindi *किस*, *जिस*, *तिस*, &c. It follows, therefore, that the forms *किसका* etc. are *pleonastic* genitives. Rendered in Prákrit they would be *किस्र* (*किदो* (or *किस्र के को*), etc., with which may be compared the genitive *कस्स केरकं* quoted above on page 23.

3. In most Gaurian languages the termination of the noun in inflexion, *i. e.* when followed by post-positions, undergoes some change, generally into *ए* or *आ*; *e. g.*, Hindi *घोड़ा* genitive *घाड़े का*; Maráthí *देव* genitive *देवाचा*. These inflexional forms, I believe, to be simply modifications of the old organic genitives of the Sanskrit. I must content myself, however, here with this simple statement, and reserve the substantiation of it to a future paper on the inflexional bases of nouns.

ESSAY III.

On the Inflexional Base of Nouns.

In the former essay I promised a paper on the inflexional base of Gaurian nouns. The present essay will be devoted to this subject, the discussion of which, it seems best to insert here, as it offers an important confirmation of the theory set forth in the former essay, and a foundation for the treatment of the other inflexional post-positions in the subsequent essays.

In most Gaurian languages, there are classes of nouns which exhibit a different form when placed in connexion with post-positions (*i. e.* in all oblique cases) from that which they have when they stand by themselves (*i. e.* in the nominative case). The former form I shall call the *oblique form*; it is identical with what is often called the inflexional base. The

* Traces of this law are seen already in Prákrit, *e. g.*, Sanskrit *कस्य* becomes in Prákrit *कस्स* or *कास* see P. P. VI, 5; or Sanskrit *दीर्घ*, Prákrit *दिग्घं* or *दीहं*; Sanskrit *ईश्वरः*, Prákrit *इस्सरो* or *ईसरो*; Sanskrit *रात्रि*, Prákrit *राती* or *रादी* or *राई*; see P. P. III, 58.

† Also *सच*, true, from Prákrit *सच्च* and Sanskrit *सत्य*; but in Naipáli regularly *साच*.

form of the noun in the nominative case I shall distinguish as the *direct form*.

In the present essay these *forms* of the noun in the plural will be altogether set aside, as in some Gauṛian languages they are of a nature, altogether different from that of these *forms* of the noun in the singular. For the present I must assume this; the proof will be given afterwards in another essay. But it will greatly simplify the enquiry to confine our attention for the present to the singular.

In the Hindí only one class of nouns possesses an *oblique form* in the singular; *viz.*, all *masculine* nouns the *direct form* of which ends in such an आ, as is a modification of the Prákrit nominative sing. masculine termination ओ. The *oblique form* differs from the *direct form* in changing the termination आ to ए; *e. g.*, nominative घोड़ा horse, genitive घोड़े का; बड़ा large, बड़े का &c. The above definition implies that all those nouns have passed into the Hindí from the Prákrit and, therefore, excludes all such nouns ending in आ as have been transferred to the Hindí direct from the Sânskrit or Arabic; *e. g.*, राजा king, पिता father, देवता God, मुक्ता priest, खेदा God, &c. All other nouns, whether masculine or feminine, have no *oblique form* differing from the *direct form*; *e. g.*, nominative पिता father, genitive पिता का; जल water, genitive जल का; माली gardener, genitive माली का; साधु devotee, gen. साधु का; पुत्री daughter, genitive पुत्री का; बात (fem.) word, gen. बात का, &c.

The Panjâbí agrees with the Hindí in every particular; *e. g.*, nominative संडा boy, gen. संडे दा; but आत्मा soul, gen. आत्मा दा; मनुख man, gen. मनुखे दा; पाली herdsman, gen. पाली दा; पिउ father, gen. पिउ दा; काँडे crow, gen. काँडे दा; बला calamity, gen. बला दा; माँडे mother, gen. माँडे दा; पी daughter, gen. पी दा. To the masc. nouns in आ must be counted also those terminating in आँ; *e. g.*, बनोआँ shopkeeper, gen. बनिरँ दा. (See Panjâbí Grammar of the American Mission in Lodiáná).

The Sindhí follows the Hindí and Panjâbí with this qualification, that it retains the Prákrit termination ओ, and that, therefore, to the Hindí and Panjâbí class of nouns in आ correspond in Sindhí the nouns ending in ओ. The *oblique form* changes the terminations ओ of the *direct form* into ए, as in Hindí and Panjâbí; *e. g.*, nominative घोड़ा horse, gen. घोड़े जो; but मुर्ष man, gen. मुर्षे जो; जाल woman, gen. जाल जा; गरुह word, gen. गरुह जो; घोड़ी mare, gen. घोड़ी जो; मानी bread, gen. मानी जो &c. (See W. H. Wathen's Sindhí Grammar).

The Naipâli and Gujarâti again agree with the Sindhí, with this exception that they change the termination ओ of the *direct form* into आ of the *oblique form* instead of ए. Similarly the Gujarâti neuter nouns in ई change their final in the *oblique form* into आँ; *e. g.*,

Naipáli ; nominative	कुरा	word, gen.	कुरा का ;
but	”	राजा king	” राजा को
”	”	सन्तान son	” सन्तान का
”	”	पट्टि course	” पट्टि का
”	”	प्रभु lord	” प्रभु को

(Examples from St. Luke's Gospel.)

Gujarátí ; nominative	मasc.	धंधा	business	gen.	धंधा ना
”	neut.	सोनुं	gold	”	सोनां नो ;
but	”	मasc.	देव	God	” देव ना
”	”	”	राजा	king	” राजा ना
”	”	”	भोचो	shoe maker	” भाचो ना
”	”	”	लाडु	sweetmeat	” लाडु नो
”	fem.	बाला	girl	”	बाला नो
”	”	”	पाथो	book	” पोथो नो
”	”	”	सासु	mother-in-law	” सासु नो
”	”	”	हरडे	yellow myr.	” हरड नो
”	”	”	रबै	churningstaff	” रबै नो
”	”	”	घो	iguana	” घो नो
”	neut.	जंगल	thicket	”	जंगल नो
”	”	”	पानी	water	” पानी ना

(See Grammar of Shapurji Edalji.)

It is manifest that all these Gaurian languages allow an *oblique form* only to such nouns as have passed *directly* or *immediately* from the Prákrit into the Gaurian, which form part, as it were, of the original stock of vocables with which the Gaurian started on its way of development, when it first began to become a distinct language beside Prákrit. These nouns (*viz.* those which admit of an *oblique form*) I shall always in future distinguish briefly as the *Prákritic elements* of the Gaurian.

Besides these *Prákritic* elements of the Gaurian, there is another class of nouns in the above-mentioned languages (*viz.* Hindí, Paujábí, Sindhí, Gujarátí, Naipáli, which I shall in future call for brevity's sake the *Hindí-class Gaurian*), the nature of which is unmistakable to any one acquainted with the phonetic peculiarities of Prákrit and Sanskrit. They are purely *Sanskrit*. As the Prákrit tolerates no compound consonant in the beginning, nor a *dissimilar* compound consonant in the middle of a word ; further as it generally either changes a medial surd mute consonant to the corresponding sonant one, or elides it altogether ; and as it generally changes an aspirate mute consonant to the simple aspirate ह, it follows, that, 1, *every* Gaurian word containing a compound consonant in the beginning or a dissimilar compound consonant in the middle must be *Sanskritic* (barring of course all *foreign* words) ; 2. *Most* Gaurian words containing a medial surd mute or aspirate are *Sanskritic*, *e. g.*, wrath is in Hindí both क्रोध and

कोह; but the latter is *Prākritic*, whereas the former is purely Sanskritic; again कर्म or कार्य work are Sanskritic, but काम or काज are *Prākritic*; again लिखित written is Sanskritic, but लिखा or लिखा is *Prākritic*, &c. &c.* All such nouns I shall call the *Sanskritic elements* of the Gaurian. It needs no proof to show that this *Sanskritic* element is the most modern part of the Gaurian; modern, that is, not absolutely, but relatively to the other elements; for the presence of some of the *Sanskritic* element dates from some centuries. But a very slight examination of the Hindi literature will show that this *Sanskritic* element is least present in its oldest specimens, and that it increases in proportion as the date of the literature approaches our own times. In the High Hindi it preponderates very largely, and, as I have already remarked in the introductory essay, its introduction is still progressing.

Now what happens when we see a Sanskrit word naturalised, as it were, in the Gaurian (High Hindi)? It is simply taken in the form of the Sanskrit nominative sing. In this form it remains stereotyped in the Gaurian and serves as the Gaurian *Inflexional base* for all cases, the nominative, as well as the oblique ones; *e. g.*, wiso is in Hindi बुद्धिमान्, gen. बुद्धिमान् का. This inflexional base बुद्धिमान् is nothing but the nominative sing. of the Sanskrit word (or rather *base*) बुद्धिसत्. Again soul is in Hindi आत्मा (with gen. आत्मा का) which is merely the Sanskrit nominative sing. of the base आत्मन्. The same word occurs in Hindi also in the *Prākritic* form आप (for *Prāk.* अप्पा) in the sense of an honorific term of address. It follows from this as the distinctivo principle of the (Hindi-class) Gaurian,† that they have 1, lost the power of forming organic inflexions of a noun (as the Sanskrit and *Prākrit* do.) 2. That they leave their inflexional bases unchanged and indicate their inflexion by post-positions, and 3, that they use as their bases the nouns in the *nominative singular* belonging to a former and now fossil state of the language (*viz.*, to Sanskrit or, as we shall presently see, to *Prākrit*); having thus become unconseious of the already inflected nature of its nouns.

It has been now shown that the *Prākritic* element of the (Hindi-class) Gaurian contains all those nouns which admit of an *oblique form*, and

* These are only a few of the more broad and general criteria. There are others also; *e. g.*, in the High Hindi (not in the low Hindi of Alwar) every lingual ण of the *Prākrit* (which, as is well known, not only retains all Sanskrit lingual ण, but changes even every *single*, dental न of the Sanskrit into the lingual ण) is changed into a dental न even in those cases where the *Prākrit* represented the original Sanskrit ण. Hence every Hindi word containing a lingual ण must be Sanskritic; *e. g.*, करना to do is *Prākritic*, but करणीयं to do and कारण cause are *Sanskritic*; कान ear is *Prākritic*, but कर्ण ear Sanskritic, &c.

† *I. e.*, of the Gaurian after its full development as a distinct and separate language; leaving out of account, therefore, the *Prākritic* element, which represents a state of the Gaurian, when it was not yet distinct from *Prākrit*.

that all *Sanskritic* elements (of the Gaurian) belong to that class of nouns which admit of no *oblique form*, a class which is much more extensive than the other. But *Sanskritic* elements do not account for the whole of the nouns belonging to that class. There are many nouns in this class which 1., exhibit all the phonetic peculiarities (enumerated above) of the Prākṛit; which 2., have the form of the nominative sing. of the Prākṛit; and which 3., preserve this form unchanged in all cases (*i. e.*, do not admit of an *oblique form*), indicating their inflexion by post-positions; *e. g.*, elephant is in Hindi हाथी; it is identical with the Prākṛit nominative singular हथी (= Sanskrit हस्ती, nominative singular of the base हस्तिन्), and is in Hindi the (*inflexional*) base of which the nominative is हाथी, the gen. हाथी का, &c. From this we conclude, 1., that all these nouns have been transferred to the Gaurian not from the Sanskrit, but from the Prākṛit; but 2., that they were so transferred *not before* the distinctive principles of the Gaurian had fully established themselves, *i. e.*, after the Gaurian had finally and entirely replaced the Prākṛit as a separate and distinct language. These nouns, therefore, have an altogether different nature from those nouns which constitute the *Prākṛitic* elements of the Gaurian. The latter are the earliest elements of the Gaurian which were transferred to it from the Prākṛit at that early time when the principles of the Gaurian were not yet *formed*, but only in process of formation; when as yet the Gaurian was only a much decayed dialect of the Prākṛit. Hence the *Prākṛitic* elements have a mixed character, half Prākṛit, half Gaurian; Prākṛit they are in showing traces of *organic inflexion*, *viz.*, in the *oblique form* (as differing from the *direct form* of the nominative); Gaurian, in preserving their *oblique form* unchanged in all oblique cases alike, indicating the difference of the various oblique cases by post-positions. On the other hand the other Prākṛit nouns entered the Gaurian when its principles were fully formed; and, therefore, becoming subject to the force of those principles, they were fully assimilated by the Gaurian. I shall therefore in future denominate all such nouns as the *proper Gaurian* elements of the Gaurian, to distinguish them from the *Prākṛitic* elements on the one hand, and from the *Sanskritic* elements on the other hand.*

Thus we have seen that the whole of the Gaurian nouns are divided into three classes. 1. The *Prākṛitic* element containing all nouns, which admit an *oblique form*. 2. The *proper Gaurian* element containing one part

* By the term "Gaurian element" only, I shall designate both the *proper Gaurian* and the *Sanskritic* elements together. For all Gaurian nouns may be divided thus:—

1. *Prākṛitic* nouns, *i. e.*, admitting an *oblique form*.
2. *Gaurian* nouns, *i. e.*, not admitting an *oblique form*.
 - a. *Gaurian proper*.
 - b. *Sanskritic*.

of the nouns which do not admit an *oblique form*. 3. The *Sanskritic* element containing the remaining part of the nouns which do not admit an *oblique form*. And from what has been explained above, it follows further that these three elements or classes represent three, *in the main*, successive stages in the development or periods in the history of the Gaurian languages. The *Prákritic* element exhibits the Gaurian in its earliest stage (probably before 800 A. D.) Next comes the *proper Gaurian* element which shows the Gaurian in its middle stage (extending probably from about 800 to 1300 A. D.) Lastly comes the *Sanskritic* element showing the Gaurian in its modern form (beginning probably with about 1300 A. D.)

I may remark here *en passant*, that the nouns (now post-positions) को (Naipáli), का (Hindí); दा (Panjábí), जा (Sindhi), ना (Gujarátí), since they exhibit the phonetic peculiarities of the Prákrit (for they stand for the Prákrit [किदा or कादा or rather for] किद्वा or कद्वा and the Sanskrit [कतः or] क्तकः as explained in Essay II), and since they admit of an *oblique form* (*i. e.*, का, के, दे, जे, ना), belong to the *Prákritic* element of the Gaurian and hence to the earliest period of its history; to that time of its history, in fact, when it was yet merely a modification of Prákrit. The Gaurian was not established as a separate and distinct language until after these nouns had assumed fully the nature of mere inflexional post-positions. This fact it is important to bear in mind, when we come afterwards to the explanation of the nature of the *oblique form* of nouns; and also because, as it will be observed, it tends to confirm the theory of the origin of the genitive post-positions, given in Essay II.

Another point I may also dispose of here, before I pass on to the examination of the *oblique form* in the remaining Gaurian languages, (Maráthí, Bangáli, Uṛiya). It has been stated that it is a principle of the Hindí-class Gaurian languages that they assume as their inflexional bases the nouns of their parent languages (Prákrit and Sanskrit) in the form of the nominative singular and preserve this form throughout in all cases. Here two phonetic laws come into play which have the curious effect of making the terminations of many *Sanskritic* and *proper Gaurian* nouns, which would otherwise have been widely different, identical; so that looking simply at the termination, it would be impossible in some cases to judge, to which class of elements such nouns belong. These two phonetic laws are; *first*, the well known law, that final short vowels in Gaurian are *quiescent* or not pronounced, so that a word, though ending in reality in a short vowel, *virtually* terminates in a consonant and is treated accordingly. In most Gaurian grammars such nouns and those ending *really* in consonants are considered alike as constituting the consonantal declension and are subject to identical rules of inflexion. For clearness of distinction in these

essays, all Gaurian words really ending in consonants will have the VIRAMA (विराम) appended to them while those which end only virtually in consonants (but really in short vowels) will be written without it; *e. g.*, कान *ear* is pronounced *kán* not *kána*, and treated exactly like बुद्धिमान् *wise* (pronounced *budhimán*, not *budhimána*). This explains also how it happened that some words which really end in इ or उ come to be written as if ending in अ. The truth is, that they are not really written with a final अ, but their final इ or उ not being pronounced, was also not written.* The transcription of the word assimilated itself to the pronunciation; *e. g.*, आग *fire* seems at first sight by the analogy of कान, &c., to be really *ága* though pronounced only *ág*; but this is only in appearance, in truth आग stands for आगि (Prákrit अग्गी, Sanskrit अग्निः), but as final इ was not pronounced, it was also suppressed in writing. So again the modern High Hindi कर having done stands for the older Low Hindi करि (Prákrit करिअ, Sanskrit कर्त्ता), which has dropped its final इ, in accommodation to the pronunciation. In poetry, indeed, आग, कर and other nouns of the same nature are commonly treated as if terminating in अ (*i. e.*, *ága*, *kara*, not as *ág*, *kar*.) but this is merely because according to the native grammatical system, the vowel अ is supposed to be inherent in every consonant.

The *second* law is this, that a final diphthong or long vowel of the Prákrit is reduced by the Gaurian to its inherent simple vowel. The inherent simple vowel of आ is अ, of ए and ई it is इ, of औ and ऊ it is उ. In Prákrit all masculine bases in अ terminate in the nominative singular in औ or ए (cf. Pr. Prák. V. 1, XI, 10); all masculine and feminine bases in इ and उ terminate in the nominative singular in ई and ऊ (cf. Pr. Prák. V, 18); all masculine and feminine bases in आ, ई and ऊ terminate in the nominative singular in आ, ई and ऊ respectively. I have shown above that the Gaurian adopts its nouns from the Prákrit in the form of the nominative singular of the Prákrit. Now in adopting them in this manner, the Gaurian reduces their (Prákrit) terminations आ, ए, ई, औ, ऊ, regularly to their inherent simple vowels अ, इ and उ.† *E. g.*, Sanskrit वार्त्ता = Prákrit

* Traces of this phenomenon occur already in Prákrit; comp. Pr. Prák. XI, 10, according to which sūtra instead of एसे पुलिसे (for Skr. एष पुरुषः) may be said and written एसि पुलिसि as well as एष पुलिसि.

† Traces of this law are not unfrequent already in Prákrit. For the reduction of औ to उ comp. Pr. Prák. XI, ii. (*e. g.*, हसिदु for हसिदेर smiling), V, 19—20, (*e. g.*, मालाउ for मालाऔ garlands). For the reduction of ए to इ comp. Pr. Prák. V, 22. (*e. g.*, णईइ for णईए by a river), XI, 10, ii. (*e. g.*, पुलिसि for पुलिसे a man), VI, 6. (*e. g.*, कौइ for क(ए of whom). The reduction of a final आ, ई, ऊ occurs only, when they are the final of the first part of a compound; see Pr. Prák. IV. i. (*e. g.*, ऊउणअदं for ऊउणअदं the bank of the Jumuá; एइसोत्तो for एईसोत्तो the river-stream; वङ्गमुहं

वत्ता becomes in Gauṛian वात.* This is the *Proper Gauṛian* form beside which the Gauṛian possesses the word also in the *Sanskritic* form वात्ता. The earliest Gauṛian form of वात is वत्त, which is as nearly as possible like the Prakṛit वत्ता. It occurs *e. g.*, in Chand's Prithirāja Rāyasa (III. 64): भक्तनि वत्त मिट्टि न को, *i. e.*, कोई जानेवाली वात नहीं मिटती है ॥ Again Sanskrit ल्लेहः = Prakṛit सनेहो becomes in Gauṛian सनेह, a form which occurs very commonly in Hindi poetry; similarly poetical Hindī has लज्ज gain for Prakṛit ल्लहो = Sanskrit लज्ज; or आयसु order, command for Prakṛit आरसा = Sanskrit आदेशः; *e. g.*, in Tulsi Dās's Ramāyan.

जाहि मुनीम जो आयसु दीन्हा ।

सो जनु काज प्रथम तेर कोन्हा ॥ *i. e.*

H. H. जिस का मुनीशने जो आदेश दिया ।

सो कार्य पहले ही उसने किया ॥

Ayodhyā Kāṇḍ.

Beside these a great many other such nouns in उ are met with in poetical Hindī; in fact, I have no doubt, every noun, that *now* in Hindī prose ends in अ.† What is, thus, a form confined in Hindī to the old and poetic language, appears in Sindhī to be preserved in the common modern language. Dr. Trumpp says: "The old Prakṛit ending in o has in Sindhī been split up into two great classes, one of which has corrupted the Prakṛit (final) o into u, the other has preserved it unchanged." He adds: "It is noteworthy that many words which in Sindhī end in o, in Hindī end in â, while on the other hand the short final u in Sindhī has in Hindī been thrown away or become quiescent." (Cf. Journ. Germ. As. Society, vol. XVI, p. 131). Also in the common modern Naipālī an important instance of that form has been preserved. The nominative plural is there formed by adding हेरु to the noun. Now हेरु is nothing else but a modification of the Prakṛit हेरो, Sanskrit धेरः multitude. Though this form has disappeared from

for वल्लसुहं having a woman's face), but comp. Pr. Prak. VI, 6 (*e. g.* कोअ for कोआ of what). Note that in Prakṛit all these forms are *optional*, but not in Gauṛian. I may add a few examples from the Mṛichchhakatikā:—

दश सुवर्णाह लङ्ग जूदकर पपलौ । *i. e.*

Skr. दश सुवर्णस्य कृता रङ्गो द्यूतकरः प्रपलामितः ॥

Again शिल्पु पडादि । - Sanskrit शिरः पतति ॥

* A few other instances are in Hindī खाट, bed, for Prakṛit खट्टा, Sanskrit खट्टा; बोन, flute, for Prakṛit वीणा, Sanskrit वीणा; लाज, shame, for Prakṛit लज्जा, Sanskrit लज्जा; जीभ, tongue, for Prakṛit जीहा (or जीभा), Sanskrit जिह्वा; झाँह, shado, for Prakṛit झाहा (see Pr. Prak. II, 18.), Sanskrit झया.

† These archaic forms are very common in poetry, only it should be noted that as they generally occur at the end of a line, they are usually lengthened to ऊ for metre's sake.

Gaṇwári and in poetical and old Hindí, the original forms still commonly occur, *e. g.*,

जहं जाहिं मकट भागि ।
तहं वरत देखहिं आगि ॥ *i. e.*

H. H. जहां जाते वानर भाग के ।
तहां जलती देखते हैं आग ॥

Lanká Kāṇḍ.

Or जलति आगि घालिली बंबर ॥ *i. e.*

H. II. जलती आग को धरी बरत में ॥

Prithirāj Rāyasā, I. 18.

Again दहन आंखि नित फरकत मोरी ॥ *i. e.*

H. H. दहनो आंख नित्य फरकती है मरी ॥

Ayodhyá Kāṇḍ.

Again आप अक्षत युवराजपद रामहि देहिं नरेश ॥ *i. e.*

आप अक्षत होके युवराजपद राम को देवें नरेश ॥

Ayodhyá Kāṇḍ.

Again पितहि बिलोकि न्नाज अति लागी ॥ *i. e.*

H. H. पिता को देखक लज्जा अत्यन्त लगी ॥

Lanká Kāṇḍ.

But also पितु आयसु सब धर्मक टीका ॥ *i. e.*

H. II. पिता का आदेश सब धर्म की टीका है ॥

Ayodhyá Kāṇḍ.

In Maráthi, where आग and similar words are mutilated in the same way (see below), the original ई appears again in the oblique cases; *e. g.*, the gen. is आगी चा, just as nom. हरि, gen. हरो चा.

An interesting question here arises: why is it that the Prākṛit termination आ has not always become उ in Gauṛian, but has remained unchanged (or become आ as in Hindí, Panjábí and Maráthi) in many instances? *e. g.*, while the Braj Bhāshá forms the Pres. Partic. हेतु being (= Prākṛit होन्ता) the High Hindí has हेता, or while the Prākṛit सनहो becomes in old Hindí सनेऊ, the Prākṛit घोडो, horse, becomes in modern Hindí घोड़ा (also in Panjábí, Maráthi, or घोड़ा in Sindhi, Gujaráti). If my previous remarks be remembered and also that हेतु, सनेऊ, etc., admit of no oblique form, while हेता, घोड़ा, etc., do admit of one (*viz.* हेते, घोड़े, etc.), it will be seen that the forms हेतु, सनेऊ, etc., belong to the *proper Gauṛian* element, while हेता, घोड़ा, etc., belong to the *Prākṛitie* element. This, however, is not yet an answer to the question. The question still remains why did some Prākṛit words ending in आ not submit to the Gauṛian principles, but retained their

In modern Hindí the form राउ (Ráo) is limited to being a certain title of nobility less than Rájá, exactly as it is also the case with the form राइ (mentioned above in the text), a perfectly parallel formation to राउ.

Prākritic complexion? The answer to this question, I believe, to be this: In Prākrit any nominal case in अ may have two forms as regards the termination: 1., a *general* form which it has also in Sanskrit; and 2., a *particular* form, peculiarly Prākrit, made by the addition of the affix क (see Pr. Prak. IV. 25); e. g., bee is भ्रमर (*general* form) or भ्रमरक (*particular* form); done is किद (*general*) or किदक (*part.*); true is सच्च (gen.) or सच्चक (*part.*), etc. The consonant क् is generally elided; hence भ्रमरअ, किदअ, सच्चअ. The nominative sing. of these cases would be respectively: भ्रमरो or भ्रमरओ (for भ्रमरको); किदो or किदओ (for किदको); सच्चो or सच्चओ (for सच्चको), etc. Now Prākrit nouns may of course pass into the Gaurian in both or either of these forms. But according as they did so in their *general* or in their *particular* form, their fate was different. If they passed into the Gaurian in their *particular*, peculiarly Prākrit form, they retained their Prākritic complexion, and these nouns constitute the Prākritic element of the Hindi-class Gaurian. On the other hand, if they passed into the Gaurian in the *general* form, they readily submitted to the action of the pure Gaurian phonetic and grammatical principles (that is, the law to change ओ to उ and the law of not admitting an *oblique form*), and thus these nouns constitute the *proper Gaurian* element of the Hindi-class Gaurian. This may be illustrated again by the present participle; "being" in Prākrit is हान्तो or हान्तओ, in both forms it passed into the Gaurian; but the form हान्तओ was contracted to हातो (for हान्तो) and remained unchanged or modified to हाता (in High Hindi); while the form हान्तो was changed to हातु (for हान्तु). It is easy enough to understand that the Gaurian termination ओ (or आ) being a *contraction* of the Prākrit termination अओ could not be reduced to उ, while the simple termination ओ could be so reduced. The same fact, viz. that the Gaurian ओ is a contraction of the Prākrit अओ, may perhaps explain its curious Braj Bhāshā form औ; for the diphthong औ (= अ + अ + उ) is more strictly an equivalent of अओ (i. e., अ + ओ or अ + अ + उ) than the simple ओ. Farther proofs of this theory I must defer for the present. I shall have occasion again to refer to it in the course of this essay.*

* Another theory has been proposed lately by Mr. Beames (Indian Antiquary, Part V., 1872) which explains the phenomenon by the different accent of the words; oxytones retaining the Prākrit termination आ (or आ); and barytones reducing it to उ (or अ). This theory is quite insufficient for the purpose. Mr. Beames himself admits that "it cannot be said that every oxytone substantive in Sanskrit gives rise to a noun in ā or o in modern languages. On the contrary the exemptions to the rule are as numerous as the illustrations of it." This admission, surely, is fatal to the theory. But though in the case of two different oxytone words it may be possible to show cause, why in the one instance the accent had its legitimate influence, but not in the other, this is manifestly inadmissible, when it is one

But to return to our enquiry, we have now seen that if a Prākṛit noun having the *general* form of its base, passed into the Gaurian, it submitted to the laws of the Gaurian. Hence *e. g.*, the nominative singular of the Prākṛit सनेहो would become the *inflexional base* in the Gaurian, not admitting an *oblique form*, but remaining unchanged in all cases; thus nominative सनेहो, genitive सनेहोका, instrumental सनेहोने, etc. But the form सनेहो of the Gaurian inflexional base is, then, modified to सनेह् which now is the unchangeable inflexional base of all cases; lastly, सनेह् is modified to सनेह which still remains the unchangeable inflexional base in modern Hindī. But this process of phonetic corruption has obtained in all modern Gaurian languages almost without exception, and has reduced all unchangeable inflexional bases, which originally ended in आ, to the form of the crude (*general*) base in अ. Only in Marāṭhī a few isolated instances of the original unchangeable inflexional base in ओ remains; *e. g.*, लाहो gain (= nominative singular Prākṛit लाहो = Sanskrit लाभः) has nominative लाहो, gen. लाहो चा, dat. लाहोला, etc. In the present poetical and old Hindī it occurs only as लाह, and from the modern High Hindī it has disappeared altogether and has been substituted by the *Sanskritic* लाभ. Some other instances in Marāṭhī of the base in ओ are बापो surprise, डाहो sensation of burning, टाहो moaning, माहा bees' nest.

Confining our attention to the modern Hindī and the example सनेह, we find that the modern Hindī possesses also another form of this same word; *viz.*, स्नेह, which is also the unchangeable inflexional base of all cases in the singular; thus: nominative स्नेह, gen. स्नेह का, instr. स्नेह ने, etc. The difference between them is this, that सनेह has come into the Hindī from the Prākṛit, and belongs to the *Proper Gaurian* element, whereas

and the same word which now exhibits the Prākṛit termination ओ (or आ), now the Gaurian reduced termination उ (or अ). Now, in Hindī at all events with which I am more particularly acquainted, every so-called *tadbhava adjective* may be used with both forms of the termination; (though no doubt one is more common than the other); *e. g.*, true is सच as well as सच्चा (fem. सच्ची); great is बड़ as well as बड़ा (fem. बड़ी); you may say यह बड़ गंवार है as well as यह बड़ा गंवार है he is a very vulgar man; you may also say यह बात सच है, but *not* यह बात सच्ची है; again it is more idiomatic to say यह सच बात है than यह सच्ची बात है. If it be said that it depends upon circumstances whether the accent of the *same* word should influence the termination or not, then clearly it is not the accent but that ulterior cause which determines the form of the termination. I think there can be no doubt that the real cause of the difference in the termination is the absence or presence of the *pleonastic* affix क. This accounts most easily and naturally for all the facts of the case. This is no mere a mere hypothesis; though for the present I must content myself with stating the fact; the proofs, which I hope to bring forward in another place, amount nearly to demonstration.

क्लेह has come into it from the Sanskrit directly and belongs to its *Sanskritic* element, or, as I have explained in the introductory essay, क्लेह is the high Hindí substitute for the low Hindí सनेह, which is considered to be vulgar. But what it is important to observe is this, that सनेह and क्लेह are identical as regards their termination. This is a curious result of the action of phonetic laws, by which the *Proper Gauṛian* elements, after a run of centuries through constantly changing forms, return to their original *Sanskritic* form. In the case of सनेह and क्लेह the appearance of the whole word is so alike, that perhaps it may have sometimes escaped observation that there is at all a double form of the word of so widely different origin. But the identity may even go further than this, so that in the case of not a few words it may be now impossible to determine, whether they are contributions of the Prākṛit or the Sanskrit. The cause of the identity of termination on the part of the *Sanskritic* elements of the Gauṛian is the inability of the latter to tolerate a visarga* and its want of a neuter gender. All Sanskrit nouns when incorporated into the Gauṛian, pass into it in the form of the nominative singular according to the Gauṛian principle. Thus father is पिता, brother is भ्राता, mother is माता; they are the nominatives singular of the Sanskrit bases पिट्, भ्राट्, माट्. The *proper Gauṛian* forms of these words are पिउ, भाउ or भाऊ, मातु which are still in use in the Panjábí, Maráthí and poetical Hindí. Now the nominative singular masculine of Sanskrit bases in अ, इ, and उ ends in a visarga. Hence the Gauṛian which is unable to tolerate a final visarga, elides it, and therefore *practically* adopts Sanskrit masculine nouns in अ, इ, उ in their *crude base*. Sanskrit neuter bases in इ and उ have no inflexional termination in the nominative singular, and their adoption by the Gauṛian makes, therefore, no difference in their case; but Sanskrit neuter nouns in अ end in the nominative singular in स. The Gauṛian languages which do not possess a neuter gender,† when adopting such Sanskrit neuter nouns, simply

* *E. g.* Sanskrit दुःख becomes in Hindí दुख, Sanskrit अनाकरण becomes in Hindí अनाकरण. Sometimes instead of the usual suppression of the visarga, it is turned into ह, but only in Low Hindí.

† This is strictly true only as regards *Sanskritic* neuter nouns. But as regards *Prākṛitic* neuter nouns most Gauṛian languages possess them (another evidence by the way that these *Prākṛitic* nouns are the oldest element of the Gauṛian); *e. g.*, the Maráthí, the Gujarátí, the old and poetical Hindí (in Chand Bardái) and present low Hindí Braj and Alwári dialects. The modern High Hindí, on the other hand, has lost the neuter gender throughout. Thus the Sanskrit neuter, part. fut. pass. करणीयम्, which has passed through the intermediate stage of the Prakrit into the Gauṛian languages is in Maráthí करणे, Braj करदो, Alwári करनू (all neuter); while in the High Hindí it is करना, which latter, by dropping the anuswára of the Braj, has become a masculine noun.

cut off the final **म्** and thus turn them into masculine nouns; *e. g.*, वनम् forest becomes वन, just as रामः becomes राम.

We will now pass on to the Marāṭhī. The Marāṭhī differs from the Hindī class Gaurian languages in having preserved a much larger proportion of the *Prākritic* element. It predominates in it very largely over the *proper Gaurian* element; so that of all the Gaurian languages the Marāṭhī is the most purely *Prākritic* tongue.

In Marāṭhī by far the greater majority of nouns admits of an *oblique form* and therefore, according to the canon previously laid down, belongs to the *Prākritic* element of the language. To the *proper Gaurian* element, not admitting an *oblique form*, only the following nouns belong.*

(1). All proper nouns and nouns of respect ending in आ (masc. and fem.), *e. g.*, रामा Rāma, gen. रामा चा, etc.; but माता mother मातेचा; सासरा father-in-law, gen. सासरा चा.

(2). All nouns in ए, ए, ओ, आ; as सवे habit, gen. सवेचा; त्रिवै tripod, gen. त्रिवै चा; वायको woman, gen. वायको चा; पौ mark on a die, gen. पौचा.

(3). All masculine nouns in ऊ (exc. परभू, वाटसरू, यात्रेकरू, गहू, गू, चाडू, नारू, पणवू, पू, भाऊ, माडू, रू, लाडू, विंचू, वेलू, सांकू; साडू); *e. g.*, गेरू red chalk, gen. गेरू चा; but वाटसरू traveller, gen. वाटसरा चा.

(4). All feminine nouns in ई and ऊ (exc. स्त्री and other monosyllabic nouns in ई, and the following in ऊ, *viz.* आज, ऊ, जलू, जाऊ, टालू, तालू, दारू, पिखू, धेलू, वाजू, भालू, वालू, साखू, खू); *e. g.*, गाडी carriage, gen. गारी चा; खडू chalk खडूचा; but साखू mother-in-law, gen. सासवे चा or साखे चा; स्त्री woman त्रिवेचा.

(5). The following neuter nouns in ऊं; *viz.* अवालू, आगळं, उगळूं, उवालू, खटूं, चांचूं, झांझूं, जानूं, टाटूं, पावेळं, फांफूं, राजालू, हांळं, हंघं; *e. g.*, खटूं, gen. खटूंचा; but तटूं pony, gen. तट्टा चा, and तासं ship, gen. तावा चा.

All those nouns that constitute the *proper Gaurian* element of Marāṭhī, are subject to those Gaurian laws which have been already explained; namely, they have been taken over from the *Prākrit* in the form of the nom. sing. of that language; and having entered the Gaurian (Marāṭhī) in that form, they retain it unchanged as their inflexional base of the direct as well as the oblique cases; *e. g.*, हत्ती elephant, in *Prākrit* nom. sing. हत्थी = Sanskrit हस्ती (nom. sing. of हस्तिन्) has nom. हत्ती, gen. हत्तीचा instr. हत्तीने dat. हत्तीला, etc. Again लाहो gain, in *Prākrit* लाहो, in Sanskrit लाभः (nom. sing. of लाभ) has nom. लाहो, gen. लाहोचा†

* See the Student's Manual of Marāṭhī Grammar, pp. 28, 29, and the Grammar of Marāṭhī by Dādoba Pandurang Esq., pp. 72, 73.

† All such nouns in ओ are in reality anomalous; as according to the ordinary phonetic laws of the Gaurian, the final *Prākrit* ओ should be reduced to अ (*i. e.* first to उ, then to अ). Accordingly we find that the nouns in ओ are only a very few isolated cases.

But (as in the Hindī class Gauṛian languages) that form of the noun (*i. e.* the nom. sing. of the Prākṛit) undergoes in its passage from the Prākṛit to the Gauṛian various phonetic modifications in its termination. The following are typical examples रामो, nom. sing. Prākṛit of राम (= Sanskrit रामः), changes in the Gauṛian its final diphthong to the more agreeable long vowel आ, thus रामा which, then, remains the unchangeable inflexional base of all cases. Compare in Hindī घोडा for Prākṛit घोडे or घोड़ओ, etc. Again the Marāṭhī तिवै stands for the Prākṛit nom. sing. तिवदी (for Sanskrit त्रिपदी); the medial द is elided, leaving तिवई which form occurs in Marāṭhī as an alternative of तिवै; finally तिवई changes to तिवै which being now a modification altogether peculiar to the Gauṛian (Marāṭhī) remains an unchangeable inflexional base. The word तिवई illustrates also another case. It is a feminine noun, which in the sense of tripod does not occur in Sanskrit, but in Bangālī it is त्रिपदी. The affix ई, is the peculiar Gauṛian formative of the feminine, and feminine nouns thus formed are therefore subject to the Gauṛian law (of not admitting an *oblique form*); *e. g.*, गाड़ी, carriage, gen. गाड़ी चा, dat. गाड़ी ला; तिवई, gen. तिवई चा, dat. तिवई ला, etc. As the feminine termination ई, so also the fem. and masc. termination ऊ is a peculiar Gauṛian modification and hence unchangeable in inflexion; as in खडू chalk for Prākṛit खडिअ (or खडिका) = Sanskrit खटिका (or perhaps rather for a Prākṛit खडुका; गेरू chalk for Sanskrit गेरिका; बेलू bamboo for Sanskrit बर्निका and Prākṛit वानो, and so forth.

So far then (as regards the *proper Gauṛian* element) we have seen, the Marāṭhī is at one with the Hindī-class Gauṛian languages. But they differ in the treatment of their *Sanskritic* element. In the Hindī-class Gauṛian languages we have seen the rule is, to treat the *Sanskritic* element according to the law of the *proper Gauṛian* of keeping the inflexional base unchanged in all cases. On the contrary in Marāṭhī the rule is, to distribute all *Sanskritic* and foreign words among the various declensions according to their final vowels. And thus it happens that while some of them are treated according to the *proper Gauṛian* law of not admitting an *oblique form*; others come under the law of the *Prākṛitic* elements and admit an *oblique form*; *e. g.*, all Marāṭhī nouns in आ (masc. and fem.) are *Prākṛitic*; except nouns expressing titles or names, which are *Gauṛian proper*. Their analogy is exactly followed by *Sanskritic* and, we may add, *foreign* words. For while such *Sanskritic* nouns as गंगा, द्वारका, रमा, etc. (all names), and मुहम्मद, खोदा (Arabic titles), by the analogy of दादा, बाबा, काका, etc., remain unchanged, thus gen. गंगा चा, etc., मुहम्मद चा, etc.; on the other hand, all other *Sanskritic* nouns, as पिता, भ्राता, धाता, आत्मा, कर्त्ता, etc. (all masculine), by the analogy of the *Prākṛitic* words चांदा, चांगला, etc., form an *oblique form*, thus gen. पित्या चा, आत्म्या चा, just like चांब्या चा, चांगल्या चा; or the *Sanskritic* nouns भाषा, विद्या, सतिका, माता, etc. (all feminine), by the analogy of the *Prākṛitic*

nouns पागा, साला, etc., form an *oblique form*, gen. भाष चा. विद्य चा, etc., just as पागे चा, साले चा. (In the Hindî-class Gaurian, it must be remembered, all these nouns are unchangeable; thus Hindî gen. पिता का, आत्मा का, भाषा का, विद्याका, etc.). Again the *Sanskritic* nouns शाली, दोषी, पापी, etc. (nom. sing. of शालिन्, दोषिन्, etc.) form the gen. sing. शाल्या चा, दोष्या चा, पाप्या चा, by the analogy of the *Prākritic* words न्हावी, साली, etc., which form gen. न्हाव्या चा, साल्या चा. Here, however, an option is possible, for the *proper Gaurian* noun हत्ती, gen. हत्ती चा, also affords an analogy. Accordingly we find that some *Sanskritic* words have chosen to follow the analogy of हत्ती and such like Gaurian words and, according to the Gaurian law, do not admit an *oblique form*. Such are the *Sanskritic* nouns हत्ती, करी, दंडी, दन्ती, etc., and the *foreign* nouns मौलवी, काजी, मुशालशी, etc. Here a great deal of arbitrariness seems to prevail as to the analogy which should be followed. As regards the nouns in इ and उ (whether masc., fem. or neuter), they appear to be all *Sanskritic*; at least if Dadoba's grammar represents the case fairly; for none of the instances given by him (pp. 76, 78, 79, 86, 87, 89, 94, 95,) need be a word derived from the *Prākrit*; they are such as अलि, कवि, अग्नि, गुह, नृत्य (masc.), रुचि, व्यक्ति, धेनु, धातु (fem.); वारि, अस्थि, वस्तु, (neuter). It should be remembered that according to the Gaurian law explained formerly, the final visarga of the Sanskrit nom. sing. is dropped in the Gaurian; hence the nouns just mentioned are modifications of the *Sanskrit* nom. sing. कविः, अलिः, अग्निः, etc., etc. Now all these *Sanskritic* nouns are treated by the law of the *Prākritic* elements and admit an *oblique form* in long ई or ऊ. It is not very difficult to see the analogy which they follow. There are in Marāṭhī a good number of feminine nouns in अ which belong to the *Prākritic* element and form an *oblique form* in long ई. The reason of this is simply this, that they are really feminine nouns in short इ, which इ, however, according to the Gaurian law explained before, becomes quiescent and, being also suppressed in writing, is thus apparently changed to अ.* In an older state of Marāṭhī, no doubt, the original final इ was both written and spoken (similarly as it has been proved already in the case of Hindî); e. g., fire in Marāṭhī is आग (which is the *proper Gaurian* form of the word, beside which the *Sanskritic* form अग्नि is also used); in reality it is अग्नि, standing for the *Prākrit* अग्नी which (by the Gaurian law of shortening

* This law applies strictly only to words derived from *Prākrit*. In words derived from Sanskrit the final इ (or उ) is often pronounced and, as a rule, always written. This explains the fact, why all Marāṭhī nouns in इ (or उ) appear to be *Sanskritic*. Exceptionally, however, the final इ may be dropped in *Sanskritic* words; e. g., गत, जात, रीत occurs besides गति, जाति, रीति (cf. Dadoba's Grammar, p. 94), and the truth of the theory stated in the text is confirmed by these nouns, which all form their *oblique form* in long ई, as gen. गती चा, रीती चा.

final long vowels) becomes आगि in Gaurian Marāṭhī and finally आग. Other such feminine nouns are भिंत (for Sanskrit भिन्ति; Prakrit भिन्ती); भेट (perhaps Skr. अभ्यटिः); चूल (for Skr. चुल्लि; Pr. चुली); केल (for Skr. कदरी, Pr. केरी); वांक (for Skr. वक्त्री, Pr. दक्ती); पौफल (perhaps for Skr. सुपारी); बेर (for Skr. बदरी, Pr. वेरी, cf. Pr. Prak. I, 6). They form their gen. आगी चा, भिंती चा, भेंटी चा, चूली चा, केली चा, etc., etc. And following the analogy of these nouns the *Sanskritic* nouns in इ form their *oblique form* also in इ; thus gen. अग्नी चा, व्यक्ती चा, अस्थी चा. With the *Sanskritic* nouns in उ it is a similar case, there is a small number of nouns (masc. and fem.) in long ऊ which belong to the *Prākritic* element and form their *oblique form* in long ऊ. Their *oblique form* is not identical with their *direct form*, however it may seem from the form; on the contrary the termination ऊ of the *oblique form* is analogous to the termination ई of the *oblique form* of nouns in इ; while the termination ऊ of the *direct form* is the Prakrit substitute for the Sanskrit final उः. All such Marāṭhī nouns in उ, namely, are derived from bases in उ, which in Sanskrit form their nom. sing. in उः which in Prakrit changes to ऊ, and is retained anomalously in the Gaurian (instead of being reduced to उ and then made quiescent). Examples of such nouns are मेरु mount Meru, etc. The gen. of मेरु (or regularly मेरु) is मेरुचा, just as आग (or आगि) forms gen. आगी चा. Now following the analogy of these nouns in ऊ (or as it ought to be according to the strict Gaurian law उ) the *Sanskritic* nouns in उ make their *oblique form* in long ऊ; thus दृत्य has gen. दृत्यु चा; धातु has gen. धातूचा, etc.—Beside that class of feminine nouns in अ which form their *oblique form* in ई, there is another class of feminine nouns in अ which form their *oblique form* in ए; e. g., जीभ tongue, gen. जीभेचा. The final अ of this class is the Sanskrit and Prakrit final आ shortened to अ according to the Gaurian law; thus जीभ stands for the Sanskrit जिह्वा, Prakrit जीहा or जीभा (cf. Pr. Prak. I. 17.) Now in consequence of the native grammatical fiction, that the vowel अ is inherent in all consonants all foreign feminine nouns which really end in a consonant, are supposed to end in अ; and hence it comes to pass that they are treated according to the analogy of the *Prākritic* feminine nouns in अ. But as the latter admit a two-fold *oblique form* either in ई or in ए, the foreign feminine nouns also form their *oblique form*, some in ई, others in ए. There seems some rule to obtain whether they should form the *oblique form* in ई or in ए. But I find a great difference among Marāṭhī grammarians as to that rule; e. g., according to the *Manual* all foreign fem. nouns in त, द, न make their *oblique form* in ई, but all abstract nouns formed by the Arabic formative त, as ताजीम, तच्चीम, तारीख, तालीम, तसरीफ, etc., form their *oblique form* in ए. On the other hand in Dadobā's Grammar some of the abstract nouns with initial त are said to form their *oblique form* in ई, as तच्चीम; others as तालीम, तारीख even in आ, as if they were mascul. nouns (according to the ana-

logy of the Prākritic masc. nouns in अ, which will be explained presently). Again while the *Manual* declines, e. g., जंजीर chain, मोहीम beloved in the gen. जंजीरे चा, मोहीमे चा; Dadoba makes the gen. जंजीरी चा, मोहीमी चा, etc.—There remains still to consider the case of the *Sanskritic* nouns in अ (masc. and neuter). Their final is the resultant of the dropping, according to the Gaurian law, of the visarga and anuswāra of the nom. sing. of the nouns in Sanskrit; e. g., the Marāṭhī (*Sanskritic*) nouns देव, वन are modifications of the Sanskrit nom. sing. देवः, वनं. All (non-Sanskritic) Marāṭhī nouns in अ belong to the *Prākritic* element, making an *oblique form* in आ, and their analogy is followed by the *Sanskritic* nouns in अ and also by such foreign nouns as really end in a consonant, but, according to the native grammatical fiction, are supposed to end in अ; e. g., as the *Prākritic* घाम heat (for Skr. घामः, Prākrit घमो); दूध milk (for Skr. दुग्धः, Pr. दुद्धो) have in the gen. घामाचा, दूधाचा; so the *Sanskritic* देव God, etc., have देवाचा and the foreign nouns कुसर fault, etc., have gen. कुसराचा.

Here the same interesting question arises which I have had occasion to touch upon when treating of the *proper Gaurian* nouns in अ in the Hindi-class Gaurian languages. The problem there was to explain the reason, why, while all Prākrit nouns (having a base in अ) end in the nom. sing. in ऐ, in the Hindi-class Gaurian languages some of them modify ऐ to आ and retain their *Prākritic* character in admitting an *oblique form* (in ए or आ), and others modify आ to अ and assume the *proper Gaurian* nature of not admitting an *oblique form*. A very similar phenomenon is exhibited by the Marāṭhī. Here we have 1., *Prākritic* nouns in अ, as दूध milk, घाम heat, पाख wing, नीज sleep, घाट bell, झेंट lip, etc. Their final अ has no doubt arisen by the same process as the final अ of such words in Hindī (as explained above); viz., the original Prākrit termination ऐ changed to उ, and this उ afterwards become *quiescent* and thus, being omitted in writing, was substituted by अ. These nouns form their *oblique form* in आ, thus gen. दूधाचा, घामा चा, नीजा चा, etc. 2., *Prākritic* nouns in आ as घोडा horse, चांगला good (in fact all adjectives in आ) which form their *oblique form* in आ, thus gen. घोडाचा, चांगल्या चा, etc. The final आ in this class of nouns has arisen, as in the Hindi-class Gaurian, by substituting the more agreeable long vowel आ for the harsher Prākrit diphthong ऐ. In old Marāṭhī and in the pronouns तो, जो, etc., the original Prākrit diphthong ऐ is still preserved (see *Manual* p. 47, rule 81, note).* The difference between these two classes is to be

* According to the *Manual*, p. 29, nouns in एरा and पखा do not change in the oblique cases. But this is wrong according to Dadoba's grammar, where p. 74, rule 207, the nouns in पखा are declined exactly as all other nouns in आ, viz., making an *oblique form* in या; thus देवपखा चा, and p. 266, where from the examples of

explained by the same principle by which the similar difference in the Hindī-class Ganṛian was explained; *viz.*, that it is caused by a difference in their resp. derivative bases. The nouns in अ with an *oblique form* in आ, namely, are derived from the *general* base of the word in अ, but the nouns in आ with the *oblique form* in या from the *particular* (Prākṛit) base formed by the affix क (or more accurately as will be shown hereafter, इक); *e. g.*, धाम is derived from the *general* base धम्म (Sanskrit धर्म), but घोड़ा from the *particular* Prākṛit base घोड़िक (= घोड़क, as कैरिक = कैरक) or Sanskrit घोटक. The full discussion and proof of this important principle I must defer till I come to the explanation of the nature of the *oblique form* of the inflexional base of nouns with which it is closely connected. Here I will only note that a parallel phenomenon is exhibited by the neuter nouns, some of which terminate in अ, others in जं or एं or ईं. Of these the former correspond to the mascul. nouns in अ; as the final अ of the latter is a modification of the Prākṛit ओ and Sanskrit अः, so the final अ of the former (the neuter) is a modification of the Prākṛit (neuter) termination अं and Sanskrit अम्; again both the masc. and the neuter nouns in अ make equally their *oblique form* in आ. On the other hand the neuter nouns in जं, एं, ईं, correspond to the mascul. nouns in आ and form like the latter their *oblique form* in या or वा, and are also, like the latter, derived from the particular base in क or rather इक (perhaps उक); *e. g.*, मोती pearl. = Prākṛit मोत्तिकं (= मुत्तकं for Sanskrit मुक्त + कम्); फांखं branch of a river = Prākṛit फंसकं (or फंसुकं; see Pr. Prak. III, 36. = Sanskrit स्पर्शकम्); खंखं tear = Prākṛit खंसुकं (cf. Pr. Prak. IV. 15. for Sanskrit अयु + क), etc., etc.

We now proceed to the investigation of the *inflexional* base in Bangālī and Uṛīya. These differ from the other Gaurian languages in not possessing an *oblique form* at all. Nevertheless it is probable, that these languages are not altogether destitute of a *Prākṛitic* element. In Bangālī there are two post-positions for forming the gen. case; *viz.* एर and र. Of these एर must be the original one, for we can imagine एर having been, in the course of

nouns in णारा it appears, that they likewise are declined like ordinary nouns in आ. As regards nouns in णारा Dadoba's statement is confirmed by the Manual itself; or on p. 63, rule 112. it is said that all part. adj. in आ, as those ending in ता, खेला णारा, are declined like ordinary adjectives in आ, *i. e.*, making an *oblique form* in या. If nevertheless the first statement of the Manual should be correct, the anomaly is to be explained thus; the *oblique form* of these nouns is not identical with the direct form (that is to say these nouns do not belong to the *proper Gaurian* element) but with the *oblique form* in आ of nouns in अ. Their case is a similar one to that of some nouns in क which has been already explained. Their anomaly consists in this, that their *direct form* which originally ended in ओ was not modified to अ as demanded by Gaurian law, but only to आ.

time, phonetically curtailed into र, but not र having been expanded to एर. Hence the use of र will indicate a later inflexional formation; and accordingly we find that all those *real* Bangálí (*i. e.*, not *Sanskritic*) nouns, to which the gen. sign. र is added belong to the *proper Gaurian* element. The principles distinguishing the Gaurian element, as explained already are, that the Gaurian adopts the nouns of its parent language (Prákrit or Sanskrit) in that form which they have there in the nom. case; and the nouns thus adopted in their old nom. case, become anew the base, to which the inflexional signs of the Gaurian declension are added. This base I call the *inflexional base* in opposition to the *crude base* which is the base to which the inflexional signs (or affixes) of the Sanskrit or Prákrit are added, and which is that which the noun exhibits before any inflexional sign at all is added; *e. g.*, घोटक horse is the *crude base* to which in Sanskrit or Prákrit, the inflexional signs (or affixes) are added. The affix of the nom. sing. in Sanskrit is the visarga (*i. e.*, स्), in Prákrit षे; hence the nom. sing. of घोटक in Sanskrit is घोटकः; in Prákrit घोडको (or घोड्को). In this form घोड्को the noun is adopted by the Gaurian; and this form घोड्को or (by the modification already explained) घोड़ा becomes in the Gaurian, the base to which the inflexional signs (or post-positions) are added. Hence in Bangálí the nom. sing. of the inflexional base घोड़ा is घोड़ा (the nom. not being distinguished by any sign, *i. e.*, being identical with the Prákrit nominative); the gen. sing. घोड़ा + र or घोड़ा, etc. Similarly हाथी elephant (being the Prákrit nom. sing. हथी, Sanskrit हथी of the *crude base* हस्तिन्) has in the nom. sing. हाथी, gen. sing. हाथी + र or हाथीर. Again जौ lac has in the gen. sing. जौ + र or जौर.

The case of those Bangálí nouns which add the sign एर in the gen. sing. is probably a different one. It has been shown already in the IInd essay that एर is a curtailment of केर and that केर was added not only in the *pleonastic* way to the genitive of the noun, but also often *compounded* with the noun itself to signify the gen. case of the latter, and since only in composition (excepting the isolated case of the enclitic particle पुनर) an initial single consonant is dropped, it is the most natural way to account for the origin of एर to suppose that all the nouns to which it is added, are in the form of the *crude base* with which एर (*i. e.*, केर with the initial क् elided) is *compounded*. Now all nouns (or rather their *crude bases*) with which एर is compounded, end in अ; and अ coming into Sandhi with the diphthong ए of एर was dropped; *e. g.*, tiger is बाघ (Prákrit *crude base* for the Sanskrit *crude base* बाघ्र), and its gen. in Prákrit might be expressed by बाघकेरषे; this in Bangálí would change to बाघकेर or बाघ - एर or बाघेर, just as, *e. g.*, चर्मकार = चर्म - आर = चमार shoemaker. It will be noticed that this way of adding or *compounding* एर with the *crude base* of the noun is not according to the

principles of Gaurian, which adds the case-sign only to an *inflexional base* (or rather inflected base, *viz.*, the Prákrit nom. sing.); but strictly according to the principles of Prákrit. Hence those nouns in Bangálí which add एर constitute the *Prákritic* element of Bangálí in opposition to its *Gaurian* element which adds simply र. We may assume, that at the time of the formation of the Gaurian principles of declension, एर, (*i. e.*, the modified form of केर) had become finally established as the gen.-sign., and its real nature was forgotten. The Gaurian then added एर as an enclitic part of speech to its inflexional base to signify the genitive; *e. g.*, (घोड़े or घोड़ा (inflex. base) + एर (enclitic gen. particle); and in contact with the inflexional base which always ended in a vowel, the enclitic एर lost its initial ए, according to a regular tendency of such enclitic words; *e. g.*, the Sanskrit ददानीम् now is in Prákrit regularly only दानीम्, again पुनर् in Pr. is उण, in the Gaurian only न for ण (as in Hindi कौन for को उण = कः पुनर्). Hence घोड़ा + एर becomes घोड़ा + र or घोड़ार.

There still remains a class of Bangálí nouns which require an explanation, as they seem to contravene the ordinary rule of the gen. formation; *viz.* the Bangálí adjectives in अ, as छोटा small, बर large, भल good, etc. They add not एर as might be expected, but र; *e. g.*, छोटर, not छोटेर. If we compare these Bangálí adjectives with those nouns, that add एर, two facts become at once apparent which distinguish them one from the other, and which stand in the relation of cause and effect to each other. Those two facts are; 1, those nouns which add एर (having dropped their final अ in Sandhi with एर) end in a *consonant* and are pronounced accordingly; thus वाघ tiger is read vágh and not vágha (or vaghō). On the other hand those adjectives which add र, have retained and are pronounced with a final अ, thus छोटा small is read chhoṭa (or chhoṭō), but not chhoṭ. The other fact which is the cause and explanation of the first one is this, (2), that those Bangálí nouns which add एर occur in an *identical* form in the Hindi-class Gaurian and in Maráthí; while those which add र correspond to nouns in आ or ऐ in the Hindi-class Gaurian and in Maráthí; *e. g.*, वाघ tiger is वाघ in Hindi, Naipáli, Panjábí, Sindhí, Gujarátí and Maráthí; but छोटा small is छोटा or छोटे; भल good is भला or भले, बर great is बड़ा or बड़े, etc. in those languages. Now, as has been already shown, all such nouns ending in आ or ऐ and admitting an *oblique form* (in आ or ऐ in the Hindi-class Gaurian and या in Maráthí) belong to the *Prákritic* element of the Gaurian and are formed from the *particular* Prákrit base in क. Hence it follows that those Bangálí nouns whose final अ is pronounced, are formed from the *particular* Prákrit base in क; while those whose final अ is not pronounced are formed from the *general* base; and the final अ of the former is pronounced for the very reason because it is the remnant of the original ending अक. Take for instance the Bangálí adjective noun कटर

small, in Hindí it is **होटा** and stands, therefore for an original Prákrít **होटको** or **होटथो**. The equivalent for the latter in Bangálí would be **होटक** (or **होटथ** *i. e.* the *erude* base) and the gen. of it **होटक + एर** or **होटथ + एर** or (eliding the final **थ** in Sandhi with **एर**) **होटकेर** or **होथएर**; and now the initial **ए** of the enclitic **एर** after the final **थ** inherent in **होट** is elided just as **घोड़ा + र** instead of **घोड़ा + एर**; hence we have **होटर** *ehhoṭar* (or *ehhoṭör*). There is one exceptional gen. form in Bangálí, which proves and illustrates well the process by which **होटर** and such genitives were formed. I refer to the gen. of the pronominal adjectives **एत** or **अत** or **तत** so many, **यत** as many, **कत** how many, which have a double form (see Bang. grammar of Samachurn Sircar p. 85), either **एतर**, **अतर**, **ततर**, **यतर**, **कतर**; or **एतकेर**, **अतकेर**, **ततकेर**, **यतकेर**, **कतकेर**. From the way Samachurn spells the latter forms (*viz.*, appending a viráma to **एत्**, **अत्**, etc., and thus making them terminate with a consonant), it would appear that he considers the whole of **केर** to be the sign of the gen., and the base to be only **एत**, **अत**, **तत**, **यत**, **कत**. If this be correct the form **केर** confirms my theory that the gen. - sign **एर** or **र** is but a curtailment of an original **केर** (the remnant of the Prákrít **केरक**). But I am inclined to think that the pronounciation of **एतकेर**, **अतकेर**, etc. as *et-ker*, *at-ker*, etc., instead of *etaker*, *ataker*, etc., is only a vulgar corruption, and that the words **एतकेर** **अतकेर**, etc. ought really to be divided into **एतक + एर**, **अतक + एर**, **ततक + एर**, **यतक + एर**, **कतक + एर**, so that the base is really **एतक**, **अतक**, etc., and the gen. sign **एर**. My reason is this: the corresponding forms in Hindí are **इतना** or **इत्ना** so many, **जितना** or **जित्ना** as many, **कितना** or **कित्ना** how many, with the *oblique forms* resp. **इतने** or **इत्ने**, **जितने** or **जित्ने**, **कितने** or **कित्ने**. These words, having a *direct form* in **आ** and an *oblique form* in **ए**, belong, according to the ordinary principles of Hindí, to the Prákrític element and are derived from the *particular* Prákrít base in **क**. They presuppose, therefore, a Prákrít original **इत्तक** or **इत्तिक**, **जित्तक** or **जित्तिक**, **कित्तक** or **कित्तिक**. As a matter of fact, these forms or, at least, forms almost identical (see Pr. Prak. IV, 25.) occur in Prákrít; *viz.*, either **एत्तिथ**, **तेत्तिथ**, **जेत्तिथ**, **केत्तिथ**, (for **एत्तिक**, **तेत्तिक**, **जेत्तिक**, **केत्तिक**), or **एद्दह**, **तेद्दह**, **जेद्दह**, **केद्दह** (in which **द्** stands for **च** and **ह** for **क**, see Pr. Prakrit II, 4, **फल्लिहो** for Sanskrit **स्फटिकः**; hence = **एत्तक**, **तेत्तक**, **जेत्तक**, **केत्तक**). Here, on the one hand, the Prákrít **ए** has been reduced in Hindí to **इ**, (thus **इत्तिक** or **इत्तिथ** for **एत्तिक** or **एत्तिथ**); on the other hand, in Bangálí, it has been reduced to **थ** (thus **ततक** for **तेत्तक** or **तेद्दह**), and besides the double consonant **त्त** is reduced to one **त**.* Thus we

* These Bangálí forms **एतक**, **यतक**, **कतक**, throw light on the origin of another Gauṛian form; *viz.*, that of the Hindí participle present in **त** or **ता** (as **चलत** or **चलता** going). The Sanskrit affixes **अत्**, **वत्**, **मत्** become in Prákrít regularly **अन्त**, **वन्त**, **मन्त**; cf. Pr. Prak. IV, 25. VII. 10; thus Skr. **धनवत्** rich is Pr. **धनवन्त**, Skr. **पढत्** reading is Pr. **पढन्त**. Similarly Skr. **कियत्**, **इयत्**, **यावत्** ought to be in

have instead of the Prákrit एत्तिञ्च तेत्तिञ्च, जेत्तिञ्च, केत्तिञ्च, in Bangáli एतक, नतक, यतक, कतक.* Now in Hindí इत्ता, कित्ता, जित्ता belong to the Prákritic element; hence naturally their corresponding forms in Bangáli एतक, यतक, कतक, will belong to the Prákritic element of the Bangáli. But the Prákritic element of Bangáli is distinguished by compounding the gen. sign. एर (*i. e.*, कर) with the *crude* base (as explained above). Hence एतक, यतक, कतक being the *crude* base, their gen. is formed (एतक + एर, etc. =) एतकेर, यतकेर, कतकेर. Next the syllable क or अक is reduced to अ (or in other words the consonant क of एतकेर, etc., is elided, thus making एतएर, यतएर, कतएर) and now a final अ and initial ए meeting, the latter (being the initial of the *enclitic* एर) is elided; thus we have एतर, यतर कतर; exactly as खेटर, वरर, etc. are formed.

Lastly as regards the *Sanskritic* and foreign elements in Bangáli, they are treated on the same principle as in Maráthí; that is, according to their final letter, they are treated either by the laws of the *Gaurian* or by

Prákrit कियन्त, दयन्त, यावन्त; *in reality they are केत्त (- क), एत्त (- क) जेत्त (- क); that is, the double consonant न्त has changed to त्त. This is an extremely rare change in Prákrit; but its probability, as shown here, is beyond doubt. Lastly केत्तक, etc. changes in Bangáli to कतक, etc.; that is, the double त्त is reduced to the simple त्त. Now this explains the origin of the Hindí pres. part.; *e. g.*, चलत. The corresponding part. in Sanskrit is चलन्तु; this becomes in Prákrit चलन्त, this may change to चलत्त and finally to चलत. N. B. the Hindí form चलता, *oblique form* चलते presupposes a *particular* Prákrit base चलन्तक, next चलत्तक, next चलतक). Usually a compound consonant of which one of the constituents is a nasal, can suffer no phonetic modification; hence the combination न्त as a rule, remains unchanged. There are, however, a few very isolated cases of a change of न्त to न्द in the pres. part.; *e. g.*,

मापलाशिपविद्धा विञ्च मशिगडिञ्चा दीशन्दी जेव ॥ *i. e.*

Sanskrit मापराशिप्रविष्टव मसीगुडिकां दृश्यमानिव ॥

Mrichhakatī, 1st act.

The Prákrit commonly uses the Parasmaipada terminations for those of the átmanopada; hence दीशन्दी represents a Sanskrit दृश्यन्ती. Now as the termination अन्त, through the modified form अत्त is the original of the termination अत्त of the Hindí, Gujarátí, Maráthí pres. part., so through the modified form अन्द it is the original of the termination अद् of the Nepálí, Panjábí and Sindhí pres. part. The Hindí forms इतना, जितना, कितना; correspond to the Sindhí एतर जेतर, केतर. The affixes न, र are probably modern additions and correspond to the affix ल in the Gujarátí forms केटलो how many, etc.

* Compare with these their equivalents in Maráthí इतका, तितका, जितका, कितका, which exhibit a closer agreement even than the Hindí.

those of the *Prākritic* elements. Whenever, namely, the final of the noun is अ or a consonant (which has an अ inherent), it takes एर; in every other cases it takes र; *e. g.*, मनुष्य man has gen. मनुष्येर; बुद्धिमान् wise has gen. बुद्धिमानेर; but देवता God has gen. देवतार; सृष्टिका earth has gen. सृष्टिकार; नारी woman has gen. नारीर; पशु beast has gen. पशुर, etc.

In conclusion it may be well to recapitulate briefly the main results of the foregoing enquiry :

1. The Gaurian languages consist of three parts ; *a.*, the *Prākritic* ; *b.*, the *Gaurian* ; *c.*, the *Sanskritic*. Of these, speaking generally, the *Prākritic* is the oldest, then comes the *Gaurian Proper*, then the *Sanskritic*.

2. The *Prākritic* element consists of all those nouns which have come into the *Gaurian* from the *Prākrit*, and which have preserved traces of the old organic inflexion of the *Prākrit* declension ; *viz.*, the *Prākrit* nominative and genitive. The former (*i. e.*, the *nom.*) constitutes the inflexional base of the nominative or the *direct form* of the inflexional base in the *Gaurian* declension. The latter (*i. e.*, the *gen.*) constitutes the inflexional base of the remaining cases (which among themselves are distinguished by post-positions) or the *oblique form*. The distinguishing feature of the nouns of this class (*viz.*, of the *Prākritic* element) is their possession of an *oblique form*, different from the *direct form*.

Note.—Bangālī and Ūriyā are exceptional in so far as the *oblique form* of their *Prākritic* nouns is not the organic genitive, but probably the *crude* base of the *Prākrit* declension, and the apparent identity of the *oblique form* and the *direct form* of such nouns is the accidental result of phonetic modification of the *direct form*. I admit, however, another view is possible which would allow to the Bangālī and Ūriyā no *Prākritic* element at all but only *proper Gaurian*.

3. The *proper Gaurian* element consists of all those nouns which have been contributed also by the *Prākrit*, but which have not preserved any traces of the organic declension of the *Prākrit*. They have been transferred from the *Prākrit* into the *Gaurian* in the form of the *Prākrit* *nom. sing.*, and this form constitutes their *unchangeable* inflexional base for all cases of the *Gaurian* declension, (which distinguishes the various cases among themselves by the various post-positions). The distinguishing feature of the nouns of this class therefore is their non-possession of an *oblique form* different from the *direct form*.

4. The *Sanskritic* element consists of all those nouns which have come into the *Gaurian* language *direct* from the *Sanskrit* (not through the medium of *Prākrit*) and which like the *proper Gaurian* element admit of no *oblique form* ; their *unchangeable* inflexional base being the form of the *nom. sing.* of the *nom.* in *Sanskrit*.

5. The relation, accordingly, of these three different elements, one to another, is this; the *Prákrític* and the *proper Gaurian* parts agree in both receiving their nouns from the *Prákrít*, but differ in the former (*Prákrític*) admitting an *oblique form*, while the latter does not. The *proper Gaurian* and the *Sanskritic* parts agree in both not possessing an *oblique form*; but they differ in the former deriving its nouns from the *Prákrít*, while the latter receives them directly from the *Sanskrit*. The *Prákrític* and *Sanskritic* parts differ in every respect.

6. The great characteristic of the *Gaurian* languages in their full development, *i. e.*, after having finally separated themselves from the *Prákrít* as distinct languages by themselves, is that they do not admit an *oblique form*, but use the *nom. sing.* of their parent languages (*Sanskrit* and *Prákrít*) as their *inflexional base* for the formation of all cases, in other words that they do not form an *organic* declension. Hence the *proper Gaurian* and the *Sanskritic* nouns only are really *Gaurian*. The *Prákrític* nouns are transitional forms partaking of the character of both the *Prákrít* and the *Gaurian*.

7. Hence it follows that those *Gaurian* languages are most really *Gaurian* which contain the largest proportion of *Gaurian* elements (*i. e.*, *Gaurian Proper* and *Sanskritic*) and least of the *Prákrític* element. In this respect the *Gaurian* languages differ considerably among themselves. They may be divided into three classes: the *first* class contains only the *Maráthi*; it possesses least of the *Gaurian* element, and therefore is the most *Prákrític* of all the *Gaurian* languages, and represents most accurately the transitional stage between *Prákrít* and *Gaurian*. The *second* class contains all the remaining *Gaurian* languages, except *Bangáli* and *Uriyá*; *viz.*, *Hindí*, *Naipáli*, *Panjábi*, *Sindhí*, *Gujarátí*, (*i. e.*, the *Hindí-class Gaurian* languages), they are almost entirely pure *Gaurian*. The *third* class contains *Bangáli* and *Uriyá*. They also are almost entirely *Gaurian*; if not perhaps altogether. The difference between the *second* and *third* class consists not so much in the relative amount of the *Prákrític* element which they contain, as in the nature of the *Prákrític* element as explained in No. 2, note.

8. All *Gaurian* nouns which have been received from the *Prákrít*, are derived either from the *general* base of the word (common to both *Sanskrit* and *Prákrít*) or from a *particular* base in क (peculiar to *Prákrít*). The final sound of the *direct form* of the *inflexional base* of nouns of the latter kind is not liable to phonetic corruption (except the change of ओ to आ or ऐ), while that of the former kind is.

9. The final sound of the *direct form* of the *Gaurian* *inflexional base* (with the exceptions mentioned in No. 8) is subject to considerable phonetic corruptions. As regards those *inflexional bases* which are *Prákrít nom. sing.*, two stages of phonetic corruption may be distinguished; *a.*, a *Prákrít* final

diphthong or long vowel is reduced to its constituent short vowel, *i. e.*, अ to अ, ए or ई to इ; आ or ऊ to उ; *b.*, a final Gauṛian short vowel is made *quiescent*, so that all such inflexional bases appear in pronunciation and, generally, also in writing to end in a consonant or (since अ is considered inherent in a consonant) in अ. As regards those inflexional bases which are Sanskrit nom. sing., two stages also may be recognized; *a.*, a Sanskrit final visarga (or ह्) and anuswára (or ँ) is elided; and *b.*, if a final short vowel be the resultant of such elision, that vowel may or may not be made quiescent, but, as a rule, is always written.

The next essay (No. IV) will set forth the proof of the positions stated in No. 2 and No. 8, *i. e.*, that the *oblique form* of the *inflexional base* is identical with the Prakrit genitive; and that the phenomenon of the *direct form* of some inflexional bases retaining the original Prakrit termination आ, is owing to the fact, that they are derived from particular Prakrit bases, formed by means of the affix क.

APPENDIX TO ESSAY III.

On a closer examination of Naipáli I have been convinced, that the view of Naipáli taken in the preceding Essay must be somewhat modified, and that Naipáli is much more *Prákritie* than I thought at first; though I still think that its *Prákritie* element is not sufficiently strong to take it altogether out of the second class, *i. e.*, of the Hindí-class Gauṛian languages. But it is next to Gujarátí the most *Prákritie* of that class and therefore the nearest in that respect to Maráṭhí. In this general *respect* as well as in many particular instances which I shall have occasion at different times to notice in these essays, Naipáli shows a remarkable affinity to Maráṭhí.

My observations are based altogether on a translation of the Gospel of St. Luke into Naipáli, the only Naipáli work that I have been able to procure.* The translation, I believe, was made by Missionaries; and therefore, having been made by foreigners to whom Naipáli is yet a new language, it must be used with caution. It is full of inaccuracies of spelling, and even of grammatical mistakes here and there; *e. g.*, in ch. x. 24. आ तिभिद्देइले देखत है the use of ले (= Hindí ने) is surely in-

* I have been informed by the Rev. W. Macfarlane of Darjeeling, that the only printed Naipáli Grammar is one published in 1820 in Calcutta by Lt. Ayton, of which only one copy exists in the library of the Asiatic Society. I have been unable to obtain a loan of it.

correct; for देखत है is the present tense like Hindi देखते हैं.* Again very often consonants are spelled as compound which are in reality separated by a *quiescent* अ, as जानै instead of जानै (= Hindi जानता; also sometimes wrongly spelled जान्ता). There is also a very inscientific principle followed in attaching the *virāma* to words really ending in consonants, as well as to words apparently terminating in a consonant, but in reality in some *quiescent* vowel. But as regards the phenomena which I am now about to mention, there is every reason to believe (from general Gaurian analogy) that the language of the translation is correct.

As the first observation it may be mentioned that the *Sanskritic* element of the Naipāli is, in proportion to its *proper Gaurian and Prākritic* elements considerably less than in High Hindi. In this respect Naipāli is on a level with the more cultivated *low* Hindi dialects.

In the next place the *Prākritic* element of Naipāli includes besides that class of nouns which is the common *Prākritic* element of all Hindi-class Gaurian languages, two more classes of nouns. It has been observed that all masculine nouns terminating in आ or औ and derived through the *Prākrit* are in all Hindi-class Gaurian languages *Prākritic*. Thus Naipāli has

	<i>direct form</i>	तेरो, thine,	<i>oblique form</i>	तरा
Hindi	”	तेरा	”	तेरे
Panjābi	”	तेरा	”	तेरे
Sindhī	”	तेजो	”	तेजे
Gujarātī	”	तेरो	”	तेरो

In regard to Gujarātī, the neuter nouns in उं had to be added to that class. They necessarily belong to it, as they are nothing else, but the neuter nouns corresponding to those masculine nouns in औ. Similarly in regard to Low Hindi, the neuter nouns in औ (Braj Bhāshā) and औ (Sūra Dāsās Sūra Sāgara) had to be added. In Naipāli a like addition has to be made. It possesses probably neuter nouns in औ which form an *oblique form* in आ. I have met with such a neuter, however, in a very few instances only; and perhaps they are doubtful; † though to judge from the fact that Naipāli

* There is also apparently great confusion as to the feminine gender. The feminine is made to terminate promiscuously in ई (like होरी, girl), or in इ (like दिइ, given; though *she was* is थिई not थिइ), or in औ (like धूलो, dust, for Hindi धली or धूलि), or in आ (like सखा, fate). Now such variations are not probable in themselves, and the terminations इ, औ, आ are contrary to all Gaurian analogy. Or are they, perhaps, all misprints for ई?

† *E. g.*, St. Luke x. 18, मंले शैतान् लाइ विजुली भैं खर्ग वाट खसता देख्तां. The neuter देख्तां is here used, because शैतान् is construed with लाइ, and is, therefore, accusative and not nominative to the verb. It is what the Marāṭhī grammarians call the Bhavi Prayoga, where the verb agrees neither with the subject nor the object (see Manual §. 115, 3.); as त्य.नें त्याला मारिलें ॥

stands in its general character on a level with the Low Hindi dialects, the existence of a neuter gender is but to be expected.

To this class of *Prākritic* nouns (*viz.* masculine in औ and neuter in आँ) which Naipāli has in common with the other Hindi-class Gaurian languages, two further classes of *Prākritic* nouns are to be added. Namely, 1., a small class of nouns in उ which form their *oblique form* in आ, like the nouns in औ; *e. g.*, *own* in Naipāli is आफनु with an *oblique form* आफना; see St. Luke xxiv. 32, हामिहेब मा आफनु आफनु मन ताचै न थो कि = Hindi क्या हम लोगों में अपना अपना मन तपता न था; but St. Luke xviii. 14. थो मानिस आफना घर गयो = Hindi यह मनुष्य अपने घर को गया. All infinitives belong to this class. They have a *direct form* in उ but an *oblique form* in आ; *e. g.*, *saying* (or to say) is भननु but *in order to say* is भनना निमित्त or भनना का लागि; see St. Luke v. 23. तेरो पाप माफ भयो भनि भननु कि उठेर हिड भनि भननु कुन चाँहिँ होला हो = Hindi क्या तेरा पापमाफ ऊया ऐसा कहना अथवा उठ और चल ऐसा कहना कौन होटा है; but St. Luke v. 24 तिमिहेब जानौ भनना निमित्त = Hindi इस लिये कि तुम लोग जानो, or again St. Luke xix. 4. उ देखना का लागि बख मा चढ्यो = Hindi वह देखने के लिये उच में चढा.

2. A class of nouns with an *oblique form* in या. The *direct form* would end, probably, in औ, but it never occurs. These nouns are never met with otherwise than in their *oblique form*; *e. g.*, जानन्याहेब is *knowing (men)* = Hindi जाननेवाले; again घचघचाउन्या का लागि उघारिँह is in Hindi कटकटानेवाले के लिये खोला जायगा St. Luke ii. 10; again तिन दिन पखि उ उठन्या ह = Hindi तीन दिन के पीछे वह उठने का ह or उठेगा, St. Luke ix. 22; again उस को जन्माउन्या दिन पूरो भयो = Hindi उस का जन्मवने का दिन पूरा ऊया St. Luke i. 5, 7. From these examples the following conclusions may be drawn : *a.*, these forms are *genitives*; *b.*, they are *genitives of verbal nouns* (or as commonly called *Infinitives*). These two things appear clearly from the corresponding expressions in Hindi. *c.*, according to general Naipāli analogy, the final आ indicates that they are *oblique forms*. It may here at once be noted that this proves the identity of the *oblique form* with the *organic* genitive of the *Prākrit*, which these forms must be, if they are *genitives* at all. The ordinary *infinitives* end in उ; and it is possible that the *direct form* corresponding to these *oblique forms* in या also would end (if instances of it did exist) in उ. In that case the *infinitives* in उ would have two *oblique forms* in आ and in या. Their difference would be this, that the *oblique form* in आ is used, when the regular and proper *genitive* with the post-position को is to be formed (*e. g.*, उनले मारना को आज्ञा गराइ = Hindi उन्हें ने मारने को आज्ञा कराई, St. Luke xxiv. 20); but the form in या is used, whenever the *genitive* is used *adjectively* (*e. g.*, उ उठन्या ह = Hindi वह उठनेवाला था). I consider it, however, more probable that the *direct form* of these *oblique forms* in या would end in औ, that, *e. g.*, to उठन्या the *direct form* would be उठनो. For these forms in या correspond evidently

to the Maráthi *oblique forms* in या of nouns in आ (for ओ); thus Maráthi घेडा has genitive घेडयाचा. I have already observed that the Maráthi घेडा (and such like nouns) presupposes a Prakrit form घेडाङ्को (or घेडाङ्गे for घेडाङ्गे). This view is confirmed by the derivation of the Naipáli उठने. It stands for a Prakrit form उठणीओ (Pr. Prak. II, 17), which would represent a Sanskrit form उठनीयः (from उत् + स्था + ञनीय). The Prakrit genitive उठणीअस्स would be contracted in Naipáli to उठन्या. This, however, will be fully discussed in the IVth Essay. The adjective force is conveyed by the genitive. The genitive is used in this manner in all Gaurian languages. As regards Maráthi, see the *Manual*, §. 212, p. 132, note 1, and §. 276, note. For Panjábí, see Ludiana grammar of Panjábí §§. 43, 120. For Gujarátí, see Edalji's Gujarátí Grammar, §. 90, b. For Bangáli, see Shama Churn Sircar's Grammar p. 99, (2nd edition). In Hindí such expressions are quite idiomatic as मैं ऐसा करने का नहीं, *i. e.*, it is not my habit (or intention) to act in this manner; or this, यह वस्तु कुछ काम का नहीं, *i. e.*, this thing is useless. For some other cases of this kind, see Etherington's Hindí Grammar §. 405. In Hindí, however, in many of these cases the affix वाला (वाली fem) may also be used. This word is really a noun (as I think, the Prakrit equivalent of the Sanskrit पालक) which has merely been degraded to the position of an affix, and moreover is often a *pleonastic* addition. Its case is exactly like that of the Prakrit केरको and its Gaurian (Hindí) equivalent का, as explained in Essay II, and affords an illustration of what has been said there regarding केरको and का. Instead of saying मैं ऐसा करने का नहीं it would be equally idiomatic to say मैं ऐसा करनेवाला नहीं. In the latter sentence, the word करने is in reality already a genitive (*viz.* of करना; since it is the *oblique form* of it; more on this in essay IV); and as such has already all that *adjectival* force which the word करने वाला expresses. The addition of वाला is, therefore, in reality perfectly *pleonastic*, making the word करनेवाला *doubly* adjectival. The word करनेवाला in fact means exactly the same as करने का which, as explained in Essay II, is also a double adjective or a double genitive (for Prakrit करणीअस्स केरओ). Hence in many Hindí phrases का and वाला are interchangeable: *e. g.*, you may say पश्चिम का देश and पश्चिमवाला देश, *i. e.*, the country of the west or the western country.

Just as the Naipáli nouns with a (conjectured) *direct form* in ओ and an *oblique form* in या correspond to the Maráthi nouns in आ with an *oblique form* in या, so the Naipáli nouns with a *direct form* in उ and *oblique form* in आ correspond to the Maráthi nouns in अ with an *oblique form* in आ. Both have reduced the Prakrit nominative termination ओ (one to उ, the other to अ) in their *direct form* and have preserved the Prakrit organic genitive in their *oblique form*. There is this difference, however, that while in Maráthi the Prakrit nominative termination ओ has been worn down to

its utmost limit अ (*i. e.*, from ओ to उ and from उ to अ or rather to nothing, leaving the mere consonant), in Naipáli it has been only half worn down to उ.

Besides this class of nouns in उ which are *Prákritic* for they have an *oblique form*, the Naipáli possesses also another class of nouns in उ which are *Proper Gaurian*, because they have no *oblique form*, but retain their inflexional base in उ throughout all cases. Such nouns are, *e. g.*, आफ self = the Hindí आफ, *e. g.*, आफू लाइ र हामिहेर लाइ बचा, *i. e.*, Hindí आफ को और हम लोगों को बचा, St. Luke, xxiii. 39; चिन्ह sign, *e. g.*, कति ले एक चिन्ह मांग्यो, *i. e.*, Hindí कितनी ने एक चिन्ह मांगा, St. Luke ii. 16; and especially the noun हेर which serves as the formative of the plural; *i. e.* जसतै यनस लोगहेर का लागि चिन्ह भयो, *i. e.*, Hindí जैसे यूंस लोगों के लिये एक चिन्ह हुआ, St. Luke, ii. 30. The final उ of these nouns is the substitute of the *Prákrit* nominative termination ओ, by the Gaurian law of reduction. In old and poetical Hindi, as I have mentioned, nouns with this termination उ are often met with. In the modern High Hindí, on the other hand, it has always worn off altogether, so that the nouns end in अ or rather in a consonant. This is the case also in Naipáli in some *Proper Gaurian* nouns, *e. g.*, घाम heat for घाम्, मानिस man for मानिस्.

In conclusion I add a list of words in illustration of the above remarks.

1.—*Prákritic Nouns.*

Nom.	कुरो	word	Gen.	कुरा को,
"	धूलो	dust	"	धला को,*
"	आंखो	eye	"	आंखा को*
"	भननु	speaking	"	भनना का †
"	उठनो	rising	"	उठन्या को †

2.—*Gaurian Nouns.*

A.—*Proper Gaurian.*

Nom.	घाम	heat	Gen.	घाम को ;
"	मानिस	man	"	मानिस को ;
"	गाउँ	village	"	गाउँ को ;
"	आफु	self	"	आफु को ;
"	बेदी	girl	"	बेदी को ; ‡
"	वाती	light	"	वाती को ; ‡

* These nouns are apparently feminine.

† The nouns in उ and ओ are perhaps neuters, and ought to be written with an anuswara (thus: उँ or ओँ). Their *Prákrit* and *Sanskrit* originals are neuters, and they correspond to the Low Hindí neuters in ऊँ and औँ and the *Gujarátí* neuters in ऊँ.

‡ These nouns are feminine.